DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 492 UD 035 482

AUTHOR	Oliver, Deborah; Maddahian, Ebrahim
TITLE	K-3 District Reading Plan Evaluation: Year 2 Report.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Unified School District, CA. Program Evaluation and Research Branch.
REPORT NO	LAUSD-PARD-149
PUB DATE	2002-01-00
NOTE	102p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary School Students; *Elementary School Teachers; Primary Education; Principals; *Program Effectiveness; Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Open Court Readers; *Success for All Program

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was conducted of the second year of the K-3 District Reading Plan (2001-2002) in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), California. In September 1999, the district created the reading plan requiring the use of specific programs for low-achieving elementary schools. The evaluation also focused on alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension, all of which are important components of both the Open Court and Success for All reading plans selected by the school district. Data for the 2001-2002 evaluation came from principal (n=36), coach/facilitator (n=58), and teacher questionnaires (n=78), classroom observations, and student scores on the Stanford 9 achievement test. The evaluation focused on a sample of 46 elementary schools, but school district achievement data were also considered. Overall, school-level implementation of these programs improved from year 1 to year 2. Principals, facilitators, and teachers continued to express the need for more professional development. Teachers indicated that principals did not engage frequently in activities supporting the program, but that these activities had increased. Principals and coaches believed Open Court was most useful with standard English learners; teachers thought it was most useful for those reading above grade level. All educators thought Success for All was most useful for those reading above grade level. Overall achievement findings support the use of Open Court above Success for All, but the differential gains were minimal. An appendix contains a chart of effect sizes for programs. (Contains 34 tables and 5 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 472 492

K-3 DISTRICT READING PLAN EVALUATION
YEAR 2 REPORT

Deborah Oliver, Ph.D.
Ebrahim Maddahian, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Los Angeles Unified School District
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Planning, Assessment and Research Division Publication No. 149

January 2003

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Renfroe
Los Angeles Unified School District
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

UD 035 482

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgement

We'd like to thank all of the people who participated on this project. First of all, we'd like to thank Ronni Ephraim, Jim Morris, Pam Sasada, and Lucy Levine for always being available to answer our questions about the programs. We'd like to especially thank Julie Hintz, the chief professional expert, for all of her hard work on this evaluation. Thanks to all of the observers (Jean Biddle, Pat Boerger, Millie Hillis, Julie Hintz, Joe Marino, David Pokipala, and Anna Rivera) and all of the coders (Kim Burley, Evan Busch, Martin Cohen, Julie Hintz, Anna Rivera, and Mirella Orozco) for their time and effort. We'd like to thank the clerical staff also for their help on the typing of the questionnaire comments. Thanks to Kim Burley and Gojko Vuckovic for their comments on the report. The suggestions from Dr. Kathy Hayes were invaluable to completing this evaluation project. And finally, we'd like to thank our families, friends, and co-workers for all of their support.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... iv

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Methods..... 8

III. Findings..... 14
1. How well are Open Court and Success for All being implemented at the school level?..... 14
2. How well are the teachers implementing the District Reading Plan in the classroom?..... 29
3. To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement? 56

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations..... 83

References..... 91

Appendix..... 92

Executive Summary

This report contains the findings from an evaluation of the second year of the K-3 District Reading Plan (2001-2002). The focus is on both the implementation and the impact of both Open Court and Success for All. Where appropriate, comparisons will be made to Year 1 (2000-2001).

In September 1999, the district created the District Reading Plan requiring the use of specific reading programs for low-achieving elementary schools. In addition, the board action also included professional development and a coaching component as critical features of the plan. The primary goal of the district's new literacy plan is "literacy for every student by third grade."

In addition to the focus on the plan, the evaluation also focused on alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension (areas recently identified by the National Reading Panel as central to learning how to read). As alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension are also important components of both Open Court and Success for All, it is expected that observers would witness each of these during our classroom observations.

The key evaluation questions addressed during Year 2 were:

- How well are Open Court and Success for All being implemented at the school level (i.e., materials, professional development, support, and student needs)?
- How well are the teachers implementing the District Reading Plan in the classroom (i.e., time spent on reading/language arts, use of program materials, and instructional practices)?
- To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement?

The data for the 2001-2002 evaluation has three sources: (1) principal, coach/facilitator, and teacher questionnaires; (2) classroom observations; and (3) student

test scores on the Stanford 9. Although this evaluation focuses on a sample of 46 elementary schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, district achievement data will also be presented.

How well are Open Court and Success for All being implemented at the school level?

Overall, the school-level implementation improved from Year 1 to Year 2. A higher percentage of Open Court and Success for All teachers indicated that they received their materials compared to 2000-2001. The principals, the coaches/facilitators, and the teachers continued to express a need for more professional development. Open Court principals need an overview of the components of the program and the coaches specifically need more professional development in teaching the writing component, in helping English learners, and in their coaching skills. Open Court teachers felt they needed more training in teaching writing, conducting Independent Work Time, pacing the program, and helping English learners. Many of these same needs were expressed by the Success for All staff.

Although Open Court and Success for All teachers indicated that a large number of principals did not frequently engage in activities supporting the program, there was a general increase in these activities compared to Year 1. Open Court principals usually found the support the coaches provided to be "very useful" to "somewhat useful." They reported the coaches to be "very useful" in distributing the materials (88%) and in managing the assessment process (87%). The two categories in which they found the coaches to be least useful were facilitating discussions on making accommodations for English learners and for students reading above grade level. Open Court teachers did not find the coaches as useful as the principals did. They found them "very useful" in

distributing or making sure they had all of the instructional materials (71%). Over two-thirds found them to be "useful" or "very useful" in distributing materials (89%), providing information at small-group meetings (77%), providing information at school-wide staff meetings (74%), making sure the classrooms were set up properly (70%), and conducting professional development sessions (68%). In every category the Success for All principals found the facilitators to be at least "somewhat useful." The principals found them to be most useful in distributing materials (100%). None of the principals indicated that support in a category never occurred or that it was not at all useful. Again, Success for All teachers did not find the facilitators as useful as the principals did. Similar to the principals, the teachers found them most useful in distributing materials (91%). However, once "useful" and "very useful" were combined, 80% or more found the facilitators to be useful in all of the categories.

The Open Court principals and coaches believed the program was most successful with the standard English learners; however, teachers believed the program to be the most successful with students reading above grade level. Overall, all three groups felt the program was more effective with their students this year than last year. In fact, all three groups felt the program was better in addressing the needs of the English learners in Year 2 than Year 1. The Success for All principals, facilitators, and teachers all believed the program was most successful with the students reading above grade level. Compared to last year, principals were less confident regarding the program's ability to address the needs of the English learners but facilitators and teachers felt the same as they did in Year 1.

How well are the teachers implementing the District Reading Plan in the classrooms?

In Open Court schools, all of the grade levels met and exceeded the required amount of time on reading/language arts. In fact, teachers were most likely to spend their time on reading/language arts followed next by mathematics. As required, most of the program materials were displayed in the classrooms; however, the Concept/Question Board and the Inquiry area were still not often seen and therefore, not often used. Most of the teachers were using the assessment results to guide instruction. Teachers reported, and observations confirmed, that they were unable to complete all of the daily lessons. Observers indicated that kindergarten teachers were more likely to conduct lessons from the Preparing to Read (green) section and grades 1-3 teachers were more likely to conduct lessons from the Reading and Responding (red) section. Similar to last year, teachers often did not get to the Integrating the Curriculum (blue) section. Some teachers were also not conducting Independent Work Time; however, based on a comparison with the same second grade teachers, there was an increase from Year 1 to Year 2. Observations also showed that many of the teachers were behind on the district's pacing plan for the school year. As teachers mentioned, they needed to make accommodations in the program to meet the needs of all of their students. The observers also found that alphabetics was most often taught in the early grades but reading for fluency and comprehension activities were seen in all four grade levels. Writing was seen in almost every classroom; however, it wasn't always an Open Court lesson.

The Success for All teachers met and exceeded the required amount of minutes on reading/language arts (K-3) and the teachers spent about 90 minutes of this time on Success for All activities (Roots and Wings). Observers found that not all of the program

materials were displayed and that the teachers couldn't always finish their lessons. Almost all of the teachers were using the assessment results to guide their instruction. Alphabetics was seen in all kindergarten and first grade classrooms but few of the second and third grade classrooms; however, reading for fluency was seen in most of the classrooms and comprehension and writing activities were seen in all of the classrooms. The teachers mentioned that they were making accommodations in the program to meet the needs of all of their students. The availability of more tutoring slots was specifically requested by some of the teachers.

To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement?

Reading program outcomes were assessed by the Stanford 9 Reading, Language, and Spelling tests for the entire district and for the subsample of second and third grade teachers who were randomly selected for observation. Adjusted NCE gain scores were used to compare the impact of the reading programs on students' reading/language arts achievement, taking account of initial differences between the two programs. The overall findings support the effectiveness of the Open Court program in comparison to the Success for All program; however, the differential gains were minimal. The effect size values were either not educationally meaningful or were relatively small. At the district level, the only educationally meaningful differences were in Reading Vocabulary (2^{nd}), Reading Comprehension (3^{rd}), and Spelling (3^{rd}) in favor of Open Court.

The goal of the District Reading Plan is literacy for every student by third grade. Only 25% of the third grade students were found to be literate based on scoring at the 50^{th} percentile or higher on Reading, Language, and Spelling. However, the percentages are

higher in first and second grade, which may reflect the fact that the District Reading Plan has been implemented for more years in kindergarten through second grade.

Based on classroom observations, various indices were constructed as indicators of the Open Court 2000 program implementation. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the collective and individual effects of these factors on student gains for second grade. Third grade was not included in this analysis since this is the first year that the Open Court program was extended to the third grade. For both reading and language outcomes, instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension and instruction in the green, red, and blue sections of Open Court were the most significant predictors of achievement gains. In addition, adhering to the district pacing plan was another significant predictor of language achievement.

K-3 DISTRICT READING PLAN EVALUATION
YEAR 2 REPORT

I. Introduction

This report contains the findings from an evaluation of the second year of the K-3 District Reading Plan (2001-2002).[1] The focus is on both the implementation and the impact of the District Reading Plan as the plan is extended into all grade levels at the schools. Where appropriate, comparisons will be made to Year 1 (2000-2001).

This report consists of four sections. The introductory section presents the background of the implementation of the District Reading Plan, descriptions of the two most frequently used reading programs (Open Court and Success for All), and the evaluation questions. The methods section explains how the sample schools and classrooms were chosen and describes the instruments and protocols used. The findings section provides answers to the evaluation questions and includes both quantitative and qualitative data. Lastly, the fourth section offers conclusions and recommendations.

A. Background

During the 1998-1999 school year, the district adopted a new reading/language arts policy in which teachers were required to spend at least 90 minutes in kindergarten, 150 minutes in first and second grade, and 120 minutes in third through fifth grade on reading/language arts every day. In September 1999, the district expanded this policy creating the District Reading Plan for elementary schools. The central component of the new plan was that schools scoring below the 50th percentile in reading on the Stanford Achievement Tests Ninth Edition in second and/or third grade were required to adopt one of three reading programs: Open Court (Collections for Young Scholars or Open Court

[1] During the 1999-2000 school year the plan was only partially implemented in one-quarter of the designated schools and therefore the data collected in that year is considered baseline data.

2000), Success for All, or Language for Learning/Reading Mastery.[2] In addition to the use of these reading programs, the board action also included professional development for staff and a coaching component as critical features of the plan.

The District Reading Plan was phased in over a two-year period. During Year 1 (2000-2001), Open Court elementary schools were required to implement the program in K-2. During Year 2 (2001-2002), Open Court schools were required to introduce the program into the remaining grade levels. In contrast, Success for All schools did not phase in the program but started using it at all grade levels at the same time. Although the schools use the programs in K-5, this report focuses on only K-3 due to the emphasis on "learning to read." By fourth grade, students are expected to be "reading to learn." Furthermore, the primary goal as stated in the district's new literacy plan is "literacy for every student by third grade."

Schools not required to use one of the three programs are referred to as Schools on Waiver. These schools were exempt from choosing one of the programs because students at these schools scored at the 50th percentile or above on second and third grade reading or were making substantial gains using another program. Charter schools were also exempt from choosing one of these programs. However, some of these schools did choose to use Open Court. In addition, students whose parents wanted their children to receive primary language instruction were placed in the Waiver to Basic Program. In Success for All schools, Waiver to Basic students receive the Success for All program in Spanish, but in Open Court or Schools on Waiver, students are taught using a variety of different texts and materials.

---

[2] Only one school chose Language for Learning/Reading Mastery. As a reasonable interpretation of the data cannot be made based on a sample size of one, the school using Language for Learning/Reading Mastery will not be included in the evaluation.

In a recent report for the Milken Family Foundation on reading programs that work, Open Court and Success for All were found to be research-driven and successful (Schacter, 2001). However, it is not only important that the programs are based on solid research findings, but also that the programs are designed so they can be successfully implemented in a wide variety of schools. Therefore, this evaluation focuses on both implementation and impact. The implementation evaluation addresses school-level implementation (i.e., materials, professional development, support, and student needs) and classroom-level implementation (i.e., time spent on reading/language arts, use of program materials, and instructional practices). The Stanford Achievement Tests Ninth Edition (SAT/9), the primary standardized test used for accountability in California, is used to determine the impact of the programs.

In addition to the focus on specific program instruction, there was a secondary evaluation focus on three areas central in learning how to read: alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000). Alphabetics includes both phonemic awareness instruction and phonics instruction whereas reading fluency entails both reading speed and accuracy. Fluency strongly relates to our ability to comprehend what we read. To practice reading for fluency students read aloud and read silently. Comprehension should be the goal in reading, as it is through comprehension that we learn and gather information as well as how we get joy out of what we read. As alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension are important components of both Open Court and Success for All, it is expected that observers would witness each of these three components in our classroom observations.

B. Description of the Reading Programs

Open Court. During the second year of the District Reading Plan implementation, schools were using the following Open Court programs in their classrooms: Collections for Young Scholars, Open Court 2000, or a combination of the two. Collections for Young Scholars is an earlier edition of Open Court 2000. In 2002-2003, schools using Collections for Young Scholars were required to adopt the newest edition of Open Court, Open Court 2002. Since Collection for Young Scholars was eliminated, certain analyses will focus solely on schools using Open Court 2000.

The Open Court program emphasizes direct instruction in alphabetic and phonological awareness, as well as phonics. In the early grades, the lessons involve introduction of 43 common phonemes and their spelling patterns. Students learn these sounds through program-specific alphabet sound/spelling cards, alliterative stories, and decodable text stories. The shared reading of big books gives way to the reading of literature midway though first grade. There are four parts to each Open Court day: 1) Preparing to Read (referred to as the green section); 2) Reading and Responding (red section); 3) Integrating the Curriculum (blue section); and 4) Independent Work Time (IWT). Instruction in kindergarten focuses on introducing the alphabet, phonemic awareness, letter-sound connections, print awareness, and easy reading. First grade expands on kindergarten work to develop reading and writing fluency, build phonemic awareness, and learn essential blending and spelling strategies. Second and third grades solidify prior learning while teaching the reading skills and strategies that students use to gain knowledge and become fluent and automatic readers. According to the program developers, an Independent Work Time/Workshop (IWT) should occur every day to

allow the students time to practice or extend their learning. This also allows the teacher time to work with small groups or individuals accommodating their needs, reteaching material, listening to students read, or assessing student progress. As defined by the program, alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension are all important parts of the Open Court program.

Success for All. Success for All was designed by researchers at Johns Hopkins University with the goal of bringing every student to grade level in reading by third grade. It was designed for both English and Spanish speaking populations. Both phonemic awareness and experience with books are considered critical components of this program in the early grades. Through each component of the program, cooperative learning is incorporated to provide peer support and modeling. Since Success for All has been designed as a proactive, preventative reform model, one-to-one tutoring must be provided to identified students at risk.

In kindergarten, Success for All is a theme-based curriculum that incorporates the entire learning time and interweaves through all subject areas (Early Learning). Instruction in kindergarten focuses on oral language development and emergent literacy skills. Starting in first grade, the Roots program is implemented via the daily 90-minute reading block. During this time, students are grouped according to their instructional reading level, not their chronological age or grade level. As a result, students often rotate daily to a different teacher's classroom for the homogenous cross-grade Success for All lesson. Students are reassessed and regrouped every eight weeks to maintain the homogenous groupings. The focus of the Roots program is to have students develop sound-blending skills and reading strategies. Students in first grade start with the Roots

component of the program and then typically progress to the Wings component in second grade; however, depending on their reading performance, children may start Wings earlier or later. The focus of the Wings program is to enhance the development and application of skills, while continually building fluency, expanding vocabulary, deepening comprehension, and fostering thinking skills. Like Open Court, Success for All also focuses on alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension skills and strategies.

C. Evaluation Questions

This evaluation (2001-2002) focuses on program implementation and impact as schools phase the programs into additional grade levels at their schools. The key evaluation questions that will be addressed this year are:

1. How well are Open Court and Success for All being implemented at the school level?
2. How well are the teachers implementing the District Reading Plan in the classroom?
3. To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement?

The Los Angeles Unified School District is the second largest school district in the United States. To implement a new plan in a district of this size is a monumental task that requires several years in order to get all of the pieces in place. Implementation varies from school to school and from classroom to classroom. School-level implementation consists of material distribution, professional development, support, and student needs. Classroom-level implementation focuses on instruction as dictated by program guidelines and district policy. Classroom observations present the opportunity to see how much time is spent on reading/language arts, if teachers are using the programs, to what extent the room is set up according to program guidelines, and most importantly the kinds of

instructional activities that are occurring. Academic achievement outcomes will be described in relation to the degree of plan implementation.

II. Methods

The data for the 2001-2002 evaluation has three sources: (1) principal, coach/facilitator, and teacher questionnaires; (2) classroom observations; and (3) student test scores on the SAT/9. Although this evaluation focuses on a sample of elementary schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, district achievement data will also be presented. The following sections will describe the sampling technique, the questionnaires, the classroom observations, and the academic achievement measures.

A. Sampling

A multi-stage probability sample of schools, classrooms/teachers, and students was utilized to conduct this evaluation. At the first stage, 50 schools were selected with probabilities proportional to student enrollment from a list of all district schools having K-3 classrooms, after stratification by administrative region, percentage of English learners, and school size. The second stage of selection involved a random selection of a single kindergarten, first grade, second grade, and third grade classroom/teacher at each sample school for observation. Efforts were made to observe the same teachers from year to year; however, some teachers changed positions and/or left the school. These teachers were not replaced in the sample. For the first time, third grade teachers were included this year as third grade was added to the District Reading Plan in 2001-2002. The resultant sample is an equal probability sample of classrooms/teachers districtwide.

Of the 37 sample schools using Open Court, 28 started in 2000-2001, one school started in 1999-2000, and 8 started prior to 1999-2000.[3] Each elementary school identified as a District Reading Plan participant was given the opportunity to be an Alliance School and implement one of the programs starting in 1999-2000, ahead of the

[3] These figures exclude the Schools on Waiver using Open Court.

scheduled district rollout.[4] At those schools that volunteered to enter this program, the principals received mentoring and leadership professional development for three years. Also, schools in the Ten Schools Program had been required to use Collections for Young Scholars prior to the implementation of the District Reading Plan.

Of the six sample schools currently using Success for All, one started the program in 2000-2001, three of the schools started the reading program in 1999-2000, and two of the schools had prior experience with the program. Of the seven original Schools on Waiver schools, four are using Open Court and three are using other reading programs. This report will only focus on the 46 schools using Open Court or Success for All. The three schools not using Open Court and one school not fully implementing the Open Court program in all grade levels were eliminated from the sample.

As mentioned above, there are two different versions of Open Court being used in the district. In 2001-2002 most of the Open Court sample schools (32) used Open Court 2000, three used Open Court Collections for Young Scholars, and six used both programs (typically Collections for Young Scholars in K-2 and Open Court Reading 2000 in grades 3-5).

B. Data Collection Methodology

Principal Questionnaires. In May 2002, each of the 46 principals received a questionnaire by school mail. A second letter was sent out as a reminder. After two mailings, 37 of the principals responded (80%). Questions focused on whether they received their reading program materials, what additional professional development is needed, their perceptions regarding the usefulness of the support provided by the coach or facilitator, how well the program addressed the needs of their students, and overall

[4] Only one sample school is an Alliance school.

evaluation of the program.

Literacy Coach/School Facilitator Questionnaires. In May 2002, each of the 61 Open Court coaches and the 9 Success for All facilitators received a questionnaire by school mail. This year each of the 46 schools was assigned at least one coach or facilitator.[5] Of the 46 schools, 21 Open Court schools and 3 Success for All schools had co-coaches or co-facilitators. After a letter reminder, 58 (83%) returned their questionnaire (52 Open Court coaches and 6 Success for All facilitators). Only one of the Open Court schools didn't have at least one coach that responded (98%) and at least one of the facilitators at five of the six Success for All schools responded (83%). Similar to the principal questionnaire, questions focused on materials, professional development, and program satisfaction.

Teacher Questionnaires. In spring 2002, all 117 of the observed teachers received a questionnaire. After two mailings, 67% responded to questionnaires (67 Open Court teachers and 11 Success for All teachers). Since the sample teachers had been selected at random their responses to the questions should be representative of all teachers who remained at their same school and taught the same grade level. Questions mirror those asked of the principals and coaches/facilitators plus specific questions focusing on the support they receive from the coach/facilitator, the support they receive from their principal, and their own instructional practices.

School Observations. Classroom observations are a critical component of this evaluation because they provide a window into actual teacher practices. Four classrooms (one kindergarten and one first, one second, and one third grade) were randomly selected at each school. Over the course of the evaluation, some teachers had left the school,

[5] Last year (2000-01) not all of the Open Court schools had even one coach.

changed jobs, or changed grade levels. As indicated earlier, these teachers were not replaced; therefore, 117 teachers were observed. Observations occurred unannounced between March and early June. The observers spent the entire class time with the teachers at all four grade levels to ensure all aspects of reading/language arts instruction was observed. Although the visit was unannounced, observations were not conducted, if possible, on non-typical days in which activities such as district testing or a field trip were planned.

Trained observers completed a physical-environment checklist, an activity summary form, a form indicating how much time was spent on reading/language arts, and field notes as part of their classroom observation. There were four checklist forms: 1) Open Court; 2) Success for All Early Learning (kindergarten); 3) Success for All Roots (grades 1-3);[6] and 4) Success for All Wings (grades 1-3). All of the checklists focused on items needed to conduct the program activities. A total score was calculated as an index of how well teachers set up their classrooms as specified by program guidelines. One item, "Displays student work," was included on the checklist but was eliminated from the total score since it was a general item and not a program item. The remainder of the items included both classroom furniture arrangements (i.e., desks facing front or in clusters and a class rug area) and classroom displays. The observer completed this form while conducting the classroom observation.

Observers were asked to complete an activity summary form at the conclusion of the observation while reviewing their field notes. The summary form included a list of different types of classroom activities as well as open-ended questions related to the use

[6] Although the Roots and Wings classes can have students in grades 1-5, the teachers are teaching grades 1, 2, or 3 in their regular classrooms.

of differentiated instruction, integration of reading/language arts into other subjects, and the provision of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension. On a separate form, the observers also indicated the amount of time spent before lunch, after lunch, and over the course of the entire day on reading/language arts.

In order to obtain direct evidence of classroom instruction, observers documented teacher-student activities through detailed narratives. The observers noted the time an activity began, teacher and student behaviors, the materials used, and the time the activity ended. These field notes provide us with information on both the type of activities occurring and the amount of time spent. Training on the use of the forms and observation techniques were provided to the observers, all of whom had previous experience conducting observations either on this project or in other PERB evaluations.

Coders were hired to review the summary forms and minute tally forms and to complete an additional program summary form focusing on items specific to each program. For Open Court, coders specified the section from which they saw instruction (i.e., the green, red, or blue section). For Success for All, questions focused on what kind of reading/language arts instruction occurred during Success for All time and what occurred during the remainder of the day. Finally, for the Open Court classrooms, an experienced Open Court teacher read through the field notes to determine the level of implementation occurring in the classrooms.

Academic Achievement Measures. Kindergarten and first grade students are not required by the state to take the SAT/9; however, all first grade students do take it. Total Reading, Language, and Spelling scores were analyzed as they relate to reading/language arts instruction. In addition, the following reading subtest scores (Word Reading,

Reading Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension) were analyzed depending on the grade level (see Table 1). When making comparisons it is important to note that not all subtests are given in each grade level.

Table 1.
Stanford 9 Tests by Grade Level

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Reading	Yes	Yes	Yes
Word Reading	Yes	No	No
Reading Vocabulary	No	Yes	Yes
Reading Comprehension	Yes	Yes	Yes
Language	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spelling	Yes	Yes	Yes

Where possible, all outcomes are disaggregated by student groups to determine whether the program is meeting the needs of specific types of students.

III. Findings

1. How well are Open Court and Success for All being implemented at the school level?

This question focuses on the five main areas of school-level implementation (based on questionnaire data): 1) materials; 2) professional development; 3) principal support; 4) coach/facilitator support; and 5) student needs. The key results are summarized below.

Program Materials

Principals are required to purchase a complete set of reading materials for each teacher and a textbook and workbook for each student; therefore, provisions were made so that funding would not be an issue in acquiring them. Once received, the coaches/facilitators distribute the materials to the teachers. Most schools received all of their materials in a timely fashion. Even though a higher percentage of Open Court and Success for All teachers indicated that they received their materials compared to 2000-2001, no teacher or student should be without materials.

Professional Development

According to central office staff, almost every staff member attended a workshop; therefore, this section addresses additional professional development needs. Staff discussed their own professional development needs and those of their colleagues.

Open Court. Twenty-four of the thirty-two principals indicated that they needed additional professional development. Open Court components most frequently cited by the principals were: writing (6); Independent Work Time (4); and comprehension (3). In addition, five principals wanted help addressing the needs of their English learners, three mentioned assistance using the assessment results to guide instruction, and three needed

training on how to do effective classroom observations. Coaches expressed the need for the principal to become more knowledgeable about the program in general. The teachers' answers concerning principals' professional development needs included: improving interpersonal skills, teaching writing skills, knowing the program, working with English learners, and understanding the difficulties of the program.

Forty-two of the fifty-two coaches indicated that they themselves needed more professional development especially in the teaching of writing skills (11). Principals indicated the coaches needed additional professional development in teaching strategies for English learners (6) as well as in coaching strategies such as working effectively with teachers and managing job duties (11). The teachers' responses covered a wide variety of topics as to what they felt their coaches needed.

The most common professional development request from the teachers was for assistance with the writing component. Sixteen teachers mentioned writing, either alone or in combination with some other concern. The second most common concern was Independent Work Time (9). Pacing and helping English learners were also mentioned. Twenty-eight of the principals indicated that their teachers needed additional professional development, especially in working with English learners, teaching comprehension/ vocabulary development, conducting IWT, and teaching the writing component. All of the coaches reported that the K-3 teachers needed more professional development especially in writing (17) and IWT (16).

Overall, the principals, the coaches, and the teachers feel there is a need for more professional development. The principals need an overview of all of the components of the program. The coaches specifically need more professional development in teaching

the writing component of Open Court, in helping English learners, and in their coaching skills. The teachers felt they needed more training in teaching writing, conducting IWT, pacing the program, and helping English learners. The principals and the coaches supported this belief as well.

Success for All. Principals wanted more training in the management and use of data as well as specific content skill areas (i.e., phonics/phonemic awareness and reading comprehension/vocabulary development). Most facilitators said they needed additional professional development in how to use the data to help teachers, help with struggling readers, writing, and coaching. The Success for All teachers felt they needed training in the following areas: meeting the needs of all of their students; grammar; the writing component; reading comprehension; implementation of Roots Level 4; transitioning from Roots to Wings; and teaching the reading program to English learners.

Principal Program Support

Schools are supposed to be "learning communities" where principals, coaches/facilitators, teachers, parents, and students all work together with a shared commitment to the program and learning. This and the next section focus on what the principals and coaches/facilitators do to support reading/language arts in their schools and the perceived usefulness of their actions. Findings focus on both principal support and coach/facilitator support with respect to their job duties as defined by their job descriptions.

Morris (2002) found that the principal was a key factor in differentiating successful schools from struggling schools. For example, at successful schools, principals participate in meetings, encourage staff to believe in the program, and visit

classrooms. This was not true at struggling schools. Lack of principal support was also an area of concern in last year's evaluation. Consequently, teachers were asked to indicate how often their principal engaged in activities related to the reading program or reading/language arts in general.

Open Court. Principal support for the use of the Open Court program was strong, largely due to its perceived success at their schools. Compared to Year 1, there was an increase in the percentage of principals who supported the program strongly, but a slight decrease in overall support of the program (see Table 2).

Table 2. Open Court Principals (32)
How do you feel about the primary reading program your school is using?

	2000-2001	2001-2002
Strongly support	68%	77%
Generally support	28%	16%
Total indicating support	96%	93%

Teachers were asked about the extent to which principals engaged in a variety of program activities supporting the program. Although teachers indicated that a large number of principals did not engage in these activities or did so only once, there was a general increase in these activities compared to Year 1. However, between 12% and 66% of the teachers indicated some activities never happened. Table 3 presents the teachers' views of their principals.

Table 3. Open Court Teachers (67)
How often did your principal engage in the following activities?

	Never	Once	Once per semester	Bi-monthly	Monthly	Bi-weekly	Weekly	Daily
Observing you teaching a reading/ language arts lesson	17%	20%	36%	9%	11%	2%	6%	0%
Providing you with feedback based on the observation	26%	20%	42%	5%	6%	2%	0%	0%
Discussing reading/language arts assessment results	37%	14%	26%	11%	11%	2%	0%	0%
Discussing individual student progress in reading/language arts	66%	12%	12%	5%	2%	0%	3%	0%
Discussing the reading program at meetings	12%	6%	21%	18%	29%	6%	8%	0%
Discussing how to make accommodations in the reading program for your students	41%	11%	21%	8%	11%	5%	5%	0%
Discussing teaching strategies in reading/language arts	26%	8%	21%	17%	17%	8%	5%	0%
Discussing theory or research on reading	29%	18%	20%	14%	14%	5%	2%	0%
Discussing classroom management strategies	32%	9%	21%	14%	12%	6%	5%	2%

In conclusion, more principals indicated that they supported the use of the program than in Year 1. In addition, the teachers' felt the principal did more to actually support the program than they did previously. Unfortunately, the numbers are still very low and many of the principals are still not offering any support in key areas.

Success for All. Principals were asked both years how they felt about the use of Success for All in their schools. There was a definite decline in support for the program from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002 (see Table 4).

Table 4. Success for All Principals (5)
How do you feel about the primary reading program your school is using?

	2000-2001	2001-2002
Strongly support	75%	60%
Generally support	25%	20%
Total indicating support	100%	80%

Similar to Open Court, the teachers indicated that many of the principals did not engage in activities supporting the program or did so minimally. However, 91%

indicated that the principal did observe them once per semester but often without feedback (see Table 5). According to the teachers, the principals engaged more in these activities this year than they did in Year 1.

Table 5. Success for All Teachers (11)
How often did your principal engage in the following activities:

	Never	Once	Once per semester	Bi-monthly	Monthly	Bi-weekly	Weekly	Daily
Observing you teaching a reading/ language arts lesson	9%	0%	91%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Providing you with feedback based on the observation	27%	9%	64%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Discussing reading/language arts assessment results	9%	0%	64%	0%	27%	0%	0%	0%
Discussing individual student progress in reading/language arts	20%	20%	30%	10%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Discussing the reading program at meetings	0%	0%	18%	27%	36%	0%	18%	0%
Discussing how to make accommodations in the reading program for your students	18%	36%	18%	9%	18%	0%	0%	0%
Discussing teaching strategies in reading/language arts	0%	18%	36%	18%	18%	9%	0%	0%
Discussing theory or research on reading	9%	18%	36%	9%	9%	9%	9%	0%
Discussing classroom management strategies	9%	9%	36%	0%	36%	0%	9%	0%

In conclusion, although Success for All principals indicated that they felt less support for the program than they did in the past, there was an increase in supportive activities as compared to last year. However, like Open Court, these numbers are still very low.

Coach/Facilitator Program Support

The coaching component is crucial to the successful implementation of the program. The principal sets the tone and vision for the school and the coach/facilitator works together with the principal as part of the instructional team. The coach/facilitator duties include demonstrating lessons, observing classrooms and providing feedback,

ordering and distributing materials, planning and providing staff development, and organizing assessments. Coaches/facilitators receive continuous professional development on both program content and coaching skills.

Open Court. Coaches indicated the number one use of their time was time spent in the classroom, followed by time spent in meetings and doing paperwork/office work. Twenty-three of the coaches (44%) indicated that this was not their first year coaching. Ten felt there were positive changes this year, nine indicated both positive and negative items, and four provided only negative comments. Positive comments focused on being more knowledgeable, working better with the teachers, and having more administrative support. Negative comments focused on lack of administrative support and more paper work.

Tables 6 and 7 show how useful principals and teachers found the support provided by their coaches. Principals found the support the coaches provided to be almost always "very useful" to "somewhat useful." They reported the coaches to be "very useful" in distributing the materials (88%) and in managing the assessment process (87%). When combining "useful" and "very useful," over 60% of the principals found the coaches to be supportive in every category. This was especially true for distributing the materials (100%), managing the assessment process (100%), conducting demonstration lessons (97%), and making sure the classrooms were set up properly (94%). The categories in which they found the coaches to be least useful were facilitating discussions on making accommodations for English learners as well as for students reading above grade level.

Table 6. Open Court Principals (32)
How would you rate the usefulness of the support provided by your school's coach:

	Not at all useful	Somewhat useful	Useful	Very useful	Did not occur
Conducting demonstration lessons	0%	3%	31%	66%	0
Managing the assessment process	0%	0%	13%	87%	0
Discussing assessment results with teachers	0%	10%	23%	68%	1
Discussing assessment results with you	3%	9%	25%	63%	0
Helping teachers to plan instruction based on assessment information	0%	16%	39%	45%	1
Helping teachers with program pacing	0%	13%	29%	58%	0
Observing the teaching of the program and providing feedback	3%	25%	13%	59%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of English learners	3%	37%	27%	33%	1
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of standard English learners	3%	23%	33%	40%	1
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of students with reading disabilities/difficulties	3%	24%	38%	34%	3
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of students reading above grade level	3%	34%	21%	41%	2
Conducting professional development sessions	0%	9%	25%	66%	0
Providing information at small-group meetings (i.e., grade-level or program-level)	0%	9%	22%	69%	0
Providing information at school-wide staff meetings	0%	6%	26%	68%	1
Showing teachers the accommodations video produced by the district	7%	7%	38%	48%	2
Distributing or making sure the teachers have all of the instructional materials	0%	0%	13%	88%	0
Making sure the classroom is set up properly	0%	6%	31%	63%	0

The teachers, however, did not find the coaches as useful as the principals did. They found them "very useful" in distributing or making sure they had all of the instructional materials (71%). Over two-thirds found them to be "useful" or "very useful" in distributing materials (89%), providing information at small-group meetings (77%), providing information at school-wide staff meetings (74%), making sure the classrooms were set up properly (70%), and conducting professional development sessions (68%). Unfortunately, in all but one category some of the teachers indicated that these job duties were not even occurring.

Table 7. Open Court Teachers (67)
How would you rate the usefulness of the support you receive from your school's coach:

	Not at all useful	Somewhat useful	Useful	Very useful	Did not occur
Conducting demonstration lessons	27%	20%	27%	27%	10
Discussing the progress of individual students	27%	29%	20%	25%	10
Planning instruction based on student assessment information	22%	20%	33%	25%	11
Helping you with program pacing	13%	21%	28%	38%	5
Observing your teaching of the program and providing feedback	24%	24%	31%	21%	8
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your English learners	25%	31%	27%	16%	10
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your standard English learners	18%	27%	36%	18%	9
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your students with reading disabilities/difficulties	24%	31%	31%	15%	10
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your students reading above grade level	27%	29%	35%	8%	14
Conducting professional development sessions	10%	23%	31%	37%	3
Providing information at small-group meetings (i.e., grade-level or Program-level)	8%	15%	40%	37%	1
Providing information at school-wide staff meetings	10%	17%	37%	37%	3
Showing you the accommodations video produced by the district	20%	20%	28%	32%	11
Distributing or making sure you have all of the instructional materials	2%	9%	18%	71%	0
Making sure your classroom is set up properly	8%	22%	30%	40%	5

Teachers were asked to indicate how frequently they received help from the coaches in a few key areas. According to the teachers, coaches observed them and gave them feedback an average of 3.5 times, with a range of 0 to 15 times. Ten teachers (16%) said they were never observed. Teachers indicated that the coach gave demonstration lessons an average of 1.8 times, with a range of 0-12 times. Over one-third of the teachers specified that they never saw one. Finally, teachers were asked how often coaches helped them and then watched them practice. This was the least likely out of the three activities to occur. Teachers indicated an average of .87 times, with a range of 0-5 times. Over half (57%) said it never occurred. However, it is important to note that the district does not require the coaches to work personally with each teacher and that may

account for the low numbers of classroom observations and help given to them on specific skills areas.

Success for All. The facilitators were asked how they spent their time. Four of the six indicated the assessments and/or regrouping as the activity that accounted for most of their time, one said classroom observations, and one said disseminating materials. Two facilitators indicated that this was not their first year as a facilitator. In contrast, one felt that each year is easier, mentioning the support from the lab staff whereas the other one felt that each year is more difficult because they keep adding new parts.

In every category the principal found the facilitator to be at least "somewhat useful." Similar to Open Court, the principals found them to be most useful in distributing materials (100%). Eighty percent or more found them to be "useful" or "very useful" in all of the categories. None of the principals indicated that support in a category never occurred or that it was not at all useful (see Table 8 for the principals' responses).

Table 8. Success for All Principals (5)
How would you rate the usefulness of the support provided by your school's facilitator:

	Not at all useful	Somewhat useful	Useful	Very useful	Did not occur
Conducting demonstration lessons	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Managing the assessment process	0%	20%	0%	80%	0
Discussing assessment results with teachers	0%	20%	0%	80%	0
Discussing assessment results with you	0%	20%	0%	80%	0
Conducting the tutoring program	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Helping teachers to plan instruction based on assessment information	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Helping teachers with program pacing	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Observing the teaching of the program and providing feedback	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of English learners	0%	0%	60%	40%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of standard English learners	0%	0%	80%	20%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of students with reading disabilities/difficulties	0%	20%	40%	40%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of students reading above grade level	0%	20%	40%	40%	0
Conducting professional development sessions	0%	0%	40%	60%	0
Providing information at small-group meetings (i.e., grade-level or program-level)	0%	20%	0%	80%	0
Providing information at school-wide staff meetings	0%	0%	20%	80%	0
Distributing or making sure the teachers have all of the instructional materials	0%	0%	0%	100%	0
Making sure the classroom is set up properly	0%	0%	20%	80%	0

Overall, teachers did not find the facilitators as useful as the principals did. Similar to the principals, the teachers found them most useful in distributing materials (91%). However, once "useful" and "very useful" were combined, 80% or more found the facilitators to be useful in all of the categories (see Table 9).

Table 9. Success for All Teachers (11)
How would you rate the usefulness of the support you receive from your school's coach:

	Not at all useful	Somewhat useful	Useful	Very useful	Did not occur
Conducting demonstration lessons	20%	0%	40%	40%	5
Discussing the progress of individual students	9%	9%	55%	27%	0
Planning instruction based on student assessment information	9%	0%	64%	27%	0
Helping you with program pacing	9%	9%	46%	36%	0
Observing your teaching of the program and providing feedback	9%	0%	64%	27%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your English learners	10%	10%	70%	10%	1
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your standard English learners	9%	0%	55%	36%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your students with reading disabilities/difficulties	9%	9%	64%	18%	0
Facilitating discussions on making accommodations to meet the needs of your students reading above grade level	10%	0%	70%	20%	1
Conducting professional development sessions	0%	9%	36%	55%	0
Providing information at small-group meetings (i.e., grade-level or program-level)	0%	9%	55%	36%	0
Providing information at school-wide staff meetings	0%	9%	64%	27%	0
Distributing or making sure you have all of the instructional materials	0%	9%	0%	91%	0
Making sure your classroom is set up properly	0%	18%	45%	36%	0

Similar to the Open Court teachers, Success for All teachers indicated that they were observed with feedback an average of 3.5 times. One teacher was never observed. However, Success for All facilitators rarely gave demonstration lessons (.45 times) or helped the teacher and then watched them practice (.64 times). Most indicated that these last two activities never occurred.

Overall, the principals and the teachers found the coaches/facilitators to be useful in most areas. However, in both programs, the principals felt they were more useful than the teachers found them to be. Although the coaches/facilitators were very useful in many areas, they need to move their attention away from materials and set-up to those areas that help the teachers' instructional activities.

Student Needs

Principals, coaches/facilitators, and teachers were asked how well the program addressed the needs of different types of students. In Year 1 there were definite opinions that the program was not addressing the needs of English learners and students with reading disabilities.

Open Court. The principals and the coaches believed the program was most successful with the standard English learners; however, the teachers believed the program was most successful with students reading above grade level. This was consistent across grade levels. All three groups believed it was least successful with the students who have reading disabilities/difficulties. Overall, the three groups believed the program was more effective with their students this year than last year. In fact, last year only 35% of the principals found it successful with English learners, whereas this year 69% said it was successful. More coaches this year also believed the program was helping English learners than was the case last year (52% to 64%). The teachers also saw the program as more effective for English learners, and, in fact, felt that the needs of all four types of students were better addressed. However, of the three groups, the teachers were also the most likely to indicate the program wasn't addressing the needs of some of their students (see Tables 10, 11, and 12).

Table 10. Open Court Principals (32)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful
English learners	3%	28%	50%	19%
Standard English learners	0%	10%	58%	32%
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	3%	59%	28%	9%
Students reading above grade level	3%	31%	38%	28%

Table 11. Open Court Coaches (52)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful
English learners	2%	34%	28%	36%
Standard English learners	0%	4%	33%	64%
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	2%	38%	46%	14%
Students reading above grade level	0%	6%	35%	60%

Table 12. Open Court Teachers (67)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful	No students
English learners	12%	41%	31%	17%	6
Standard English learners	2%	14%	53%	32%	5
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	26%	51%	16%	7%	4
Students reading above grade level	5%	15%	30%	50%	4

In conclusion, principals, coaches, and teachers believed that the program, during the second year, was doing a better job of addressing the needs of the students as compared to the first year.

Success for All. The principals, the facilitators, and the teachers all believed Success for All was most successful with the students reading above grade level. Although none of the principals felt it was not successful with any of the four groups, 17% of the facilitators and 20% of the teachers felt it was "Not at all successful" with the students with reading disabilities. One teacher (9%) also found it unsuccessful with the English learners. Compared to last year, principals were less sanguine regarding the program's ability to address the needs of the English learners but facilitators and teachers felt the same as they did last year (see Tables 13, 14, and 15).

Table 13. Success for All Principals (5)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful
English learners	0%	60%	40%	0%
Standard English learners	0%	40%	60%	0%
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	0%	40%	60%	0%
Students reading above grade level	0%	20%	20%	60%

Table 14. Success for All Facilitators (6)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful
English learners	0%	33%	33%	33%
Standard English learners	0%	17%	33%	50%
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	17%	33%	50%	0%
Students reading above grade level	0%	0%	17%	83%

Table 15. Success for All Teachers (11)
How well does the reading program address the instructional needs of the following types of students?

	Not at all successful	Somewhat successful	Successful	Very successful	No students
English learners	9%	55%	18%	18%	0
Standard English learners	0%	70%	30%	0%	1
Students with reading disabilities/difficulties	20%	70%	10%	0%	1
Students reading above grade level	0%	18%	18%	64%	0

In conclusion, staff felt Success for All was better for those students reading above grade level than for English learners, standard English learners, and those with reading disabilities.

2. How well are the teachers implementing the District Reading Plan in the classrooms?

Classroom-level implementation is the key to the success of this program as program fidelity is reported to be critical to student learning. To get the most accurate picture of what was occurring in the classrooms, information was gathered in two ways. Teachers reported what they did in their classrooms and trained observers documented classroom activities. The first two sections address room set up and amount of time spent on reading/language arts. The next sections address those aspects of the programs found to be problem areas during last year's evaluation (i.e., using assessments to guide instruction, finishing daily lessons, following Open Court program pacing, accommodating the lesson to the students, conducting Open Court Independent Work Time, and using the Success for All tutoring component). Depending on the program, the observational data are broken down by either grade level (Open Court: K-3) or program level (Success for All: Early Learning, Roots, and Wings).

Room Set Up

According to program guidelines, there are items that should be prominently displayed in the classroom and furniture should be arranged in a certain formation. For example, in Open Court classrooms, the alphabet/sound cards are to be displayed so the students can easily see them. They are used to teach the pupils the sounds and their letter correspondence. Desks should be placed so all of the students are facing front. This is often a "U" formation. In Success for All classrooms, the cooperative learning standards must be displayed as they are the core of the Success for All program. They are taught and practiced in all grade levels. Desks should be arranged in clusters to promote cooperative learning. Activities are often done in pairs or small groups. Items were

tallied individually and as part of a total score. The Year 1 report indicated that the teachers did not have all of the essential physical elements of the programs present in their classrooms.

Open Court. Over 90% of the classrooms displayed student work, had a class library, displayed the sound/spelling cards, and had a rug area for the students. The display of the word wall increased from last year in K-2, all being over 90%. Similar to last year, the use of the Concept/Question Board and the Inquiry area were still not always present, although there was an increase from Year 1. The arrangement of the desks improved in all three grade levels (K-2) and third grade showed a similar pattern to the other grade levels. The average classroom had 6 of the 8 items. Third grade had the highest composite score with an average of 5 out of 6 items present. See Table 16 for the findings.

Table 16.
Open Court Physical Environment

Items	Kindergarten (n = 24)	First Grade (n = 20)	Second Grade (n = 14)	Third Grade (n = 36)
Display of student work	100%	95%	100%	95%
Class library	92%	95%	93%	95%
Alphabet cards	100%	100%	100%	97%
Word wall	92%	95%	93%	81%
Concept/question board	71%	84%	86%	78%
Inquiry area	33%	32%	29%	42%
Floor/rug area	100%	100%	93%	na
Big book	78%	55%	57%	na
Tables facing front	61%	75%	86%	81%
Total (Mean number of items)*	6	6	6	5

*N=8 items in K-2. N= 6 items in grade 3.
Note: Classrooms were eliminated if they were testing, painting, or moving.

Success for All. Success for All is different than Open Court in that there are different items required at each level (Early Learning, Roots, and Wings), although some items do overlap (see Table 17).

Table 17.
Success for All - Physical Environment

Items	Kinder (n=2)	Roots (n=2)	Wings (n=10)
Display of student work	100%	0%	80%
Class library	100%	100%	90%
Tables in clusters/teams	50%	100%	90%
Alphabet cards posted	100%	100%	na
Peabody Lang Development Kit/Lang Links	50%	50%	na
"Practice Active Listening" poster	50%	100%	70%
"Help and Encourage Each Other" poster	50%	100%	60%
"Everyone Participates" poster	50%	100%	60%
"Explain Your Ideas and Tell Why" poster	50%	100%	50%
"Complete Tasks" poster	0%	100%	60%
Evidence of a theme	100%	na	na
Evidence of letter investigation	100%	na	na
Objects in the room are labeled	100%	na	na
Environmental print posted	0%	na	na
"Kinderfriends" posted	100%	na	na
Dramatic Play Center	100%	na	na
Construction Center	100%	na	na
Art Center	100%	na	na
Library Center	100%	na	na
Writing Center	0%	na	na
Evidence of center management	100%	na	na
Word Wall	100%	100%	78%
"YES" and "NO" signs	50%	100%	na
"Word Strategies" poster	50%	100%	80%
"Bounce and Stretch" poster	0%	100%	na
"Alphie pennants" above alphabet	100	100%	na
"STaR" chart	0%	100%	na
Evidence of a points-reward system	na	0%	80%
"Alphie" puppet	na	0%	na
Current letter being studied	na	100%	na
Team names at individual tables	na	0%	6%
Green and red words with title of story	na	100%	na
"Did I Understand What I Read?" poster	na	100%	na
Word-Mastery List	na	na	90%
Listening Comprehension Chart	na	na	78%
Reading Comprehension Objective	na	na	44%
Day 1-5 guides	na	na	80%
"Steps in Writing" poster	na	na	90%
"Meaningful Sentence Checking Strategy" poster	na	na	67%
Team names posted on wall with rewards	na	na	40%
Total (Mean number of items)*			12

*N=27 items in Early Learning (k). N=22 items in Roots. N=18 items in Wings. Totals were not calculated for Early Learning and Roots because of the low number of classrooms.

Due to the limited number of classrooms, it would be misleading to make any definitive interpretations involving comparisons between Year 1 and Year 2. However, similar to Year 1, not everything is displayed as it should be.

Minutes on Reading/Language Arts

Teachers are required to spend 90 minutes in kindergarten, 150 minutes in first and second grade, and 120 minutes in third grade on reading/language arts every day. Since the observers spent the entire day in the classroom, a calculation of the time spent on reading/language arts activities was possible.

Open Court. Last year all three grade levels (K-2) met and exceeded the required amount of reading/language arts instruction. In Year 2, all four-grade levels met and exceeded the required instructional times (see Table 18).

Table 18. Open Court
Average Number of Minutes Spent on Reading/Language Arts

	2000-2001	2001-2002
K	108	120
1	177	192
2	157	183
3	*	175

* Third-grade classrooms were not observed in 2000-2001.

Only two kindergarten teachers did not teach reading/language arts for 90 minutes (82 and 63 minutes out of a total amount of school time of 200 and 190 minutes respectively). In first grade, the teachers spent an average of 154 minutes on reading/language arts before lunch and an additional 38 minutes after lunch. Only three first grade teachers didn't teach reading/language arts for the required amount of time. The second grade teachers spent an average of 159 minutes on reading/language arts before lunch and 24 minutes after lunch. Only one second grade teacher did not teach reading/language arts for 150 minutes. This was an improvement over last year, where

five of the same second grade teachers hadn't taught reading/language arts for the required 150 minutes including the one teacher who didn't this year. Third grade teachers spent an average of 144 minutes before lunch and 31 minutes after lunch on reading/language arts.

Success for All. In Year 1, two of the three grade levels met and exceeded the required amount of reading/language arts instruction. This year all four grade levels exceeded the required amount. Additionally, amount of time spent increased as a function of grade level (see Table 19).

Table 19. Success for All
Average Number of Minutes Spent on Reading/Language Arts

	2000-2001	2001-2002
K	122	135
1	141	162
2	152	192
3	*	202

* Third-grade classrooms were not observed in 2000-2001.

All but one teacher conducted reading/language arts before and after lunch. The time spent during the Success for All block varied from 85 to 93 minutes. Therefore, all four grade levels exceeded the required amount of time on reading/language arts and both the Roots and Wings classrooms all had approximately 90 minutes of Success for All instruction.

Using the Assessments to Guide Instruction

Both programs include regular student assessment. Starting during 2001-2002, the district set up a web-based system of reporting Open Court school test results and generating individual teacher reports. The results are given to the Open Court teachers to help them monitor their student's progress and guide their instruction. Success for All

testing is conducted every eight weeks to make sure the students are placed in the appropriate Success for All class.

Open Court. Seventy-eight percent of the K-3 teachers said that they use the assessment results. All of the second grade teachers do, and approximately 75% of the other teachers said they do. In Year 1, 91% of the K-2 teachers said they used assessment results to guide instruction compared to 80% in Year 2. Teachers said that they used the test results to determine focal areas for instruction and reviewing. Sometimes this is a whole group lesson, but often it is working with individuals or a small group on a specific skill. Several teachers mentioned this occurred during IWT.

Success for All. Almost all of the SFA teachers (91%) said they use the assessments. All of the teachers in first and second grade indicated that they do so. This was a slight increase from last year (86%). Six commented that they use the assessment results to identify weak areas to review and give practice.

Finishing the Lessons

Both programs have certain activities that the teachers are supposed to complete on a daily basis. In Open Court classrooms, teachers should conduct lessons in the green section, the red section, and the blue section as well as conduct IWT and a writing lesson. In Success for All classrooms, the activities depend on the program level.

Open Court. According to the Open Court teachers, in an average week, they are able to finish the lessons on 3.8 of the days. Interestingly, the higher the grade level the more likely they are able to finish (K: 3.32; 1st: 3.5; 2nd: 4.3; 3rd: 4.17). Both last year and this year, 62% indicated that they were unable to complete the lessons every day. This was supported by the observations. Teachers were not observed conducting lessons from

each of the three sections of Open Court 2000. In kindergarten, teachers were most likely to be teaching lessons from the green section; however, in grades 1-3 they were most likely to be spending time on red-section lessons. Lessons from the blue section were more likely to occur in the upper grade levels (see Table 20). Although writing activities were seen in almost all of the classrooms (96% in kindergarten and 100% in grades 1-3), they were not always part of the blue Open Court section (see Table 20).

Table 20.
Percentage of Teachers Conducting a Lesson in the Following Areas

	Preparing to Read (Green)	Reading and Responding (Red)	Integrating the Curriculum (Blue)
K	95%	33%	43%
1	81%	88%	44%
2	27%	73%	64%
3	50%	81%	61%

Success for All. Success for All teachers indicated that they were able to finish their lessons on 4.45 of the days. Similar to Open Court, the higher the grade level the more likely they are able to finish (1^{st}: 3.5; 2^{nd}: 4.25; 3^{rd}: 5). Last year, approximately one third of the teachers (36%) indicated that they were able to finish their lessons every day. In contrast, 73% of the teachers indicated that they were able to finish them in Year 2.

Following the Pacing Plan (Open Court)

To assist the teachers with pacing, central office staff provided the Open Court teachers with a pacing plan that indicated what book and story they should be teaching each month. Central office staff indicated that this should be followed within 5 days. Using this as our guideline, coders calculated whether each teacher was ahead, on target, or behind based on materials used and lessons conducted. In kindergarten, 44% were on target, 30% were ahead, and 22% were behind. In first grade, 50% were on target, 32%

were behind, and 14% were ahead.[7] In second grade, 44% were on target, 44% were behind, and 6% were ahead. Comparing the same teachers in 2000-2001 but using the 2001-2002 pacing plan, all of the teachers would have been behind in Year 1. About half (51%) of the third grade teachers were on target and 44% were behind. If a teacher was working on more than one lesson, the lesson farthest along in the books was used in the analysis.

Making Accommodations (Appropriate Strategies for Diverse Learners)

According to district guidelines, teachers are permitted to make changes in the programs to meet their students' needs. In fact, central office staff provides the Open Court coaches with an "accommodations video" to use as a teaching tool with their teachers. For Success for All Roots and Wings classrooms there shouldn't be as much of a need for accommodations because the students have already been grouped together based on their level; however, it is expected that accommodations may be needed during the regular school day when students may be of different levels. Success for All teachers are not required to see the "accommodations video."

Open Court. Of the 67 teachers that responded to the questionnaire, 11 had not seen the "accommodations video." Of those that did, 80% found it to be at least "somewhat useful."

Last year, almost all of the K-2 teachers (93%) indicated that they made accommodations. Similarly, almost all of the K-3 teachers (91%) said that they made accommodations in Year 2. However, all of the first and second grade teachers said they had made accommodations in Year 2, a slight increase from Year 1. Our observations

[7] Numbers do not always add to 100% because there were a few classrooms in which it could not be determined on what lesson they were working.

support this finding in that teachers were seen changing the lessons, adding lessons, and skipping lessons. Also, as mentioned previously, many of the teachers were not where they should be according to the district pacing plan, which may also indicate that they are slowing down the lessons or going faster to accommodate their students' needs. In fact, 60 of the 67 teachers made reference to accommodating their students. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers said they had to make accommodations for their students who couldn't keep up with the lessons. Fifteen teachers specifically mentioned that they had to make changes because of their English learners. Eight teachers indicated that they had to make the materials more challenging for their high ability students.

Success for All. Last year, almost all of the K-2 teachers (86%) said they had made accommodations. This year, most of the K-3 teachers (80%) said they made accommodations. When comparing just the K-2 teachers, there was an increase from 86% to 100%. Third grade was the only grade that had some teachers who didn't make accommodations. Similar to Open Court, the observers did not always see all of the Success for All daily components. Two teachers indicated that they had to make changes in the pacing or the schedule of the program and two indicated that they gave their students extra help and practice.

Conducting Independent Work Time (Open Court)

Independent Work Time is a time when students should manage their own work time. This is also a time when the teacher can work with small groups and/or individuals who need assistance or listen to individual students read. This component of Open Court should be occurring on a daily basis. Central office staff provided each school with a video showing how an experienced teacher conducts IWT. This video shows how IWT

changes as the students become more comfortable with the process. By the spring semester one would expect to see IWT as defined by the program guidelines. Unfortunately, the teachers were not asked if they saw this video.

According to the Open Court teachers, in an average week, they conduct Independent Work Time (IWT) on 3.79 days. This year 43% said they did it on all 5 days and only 3% indicated that they weren't doing this part of the program. If they did do IWT it usually lasted about 32 minutes with a range of 3 to 90 minutes. There were slight differences depending on the grade level. Kindergarten, first, and second all said they conducted IWT on four out of five days for 25, 32, and 40 minutes respectively. Third grade, which is new to the program in most schools, reported conducting IWT on three out of five days for 35 minutes. This finding is similar to last year as 3% also indicated that they didn't do it and those that did also averaged about half an hour a day.

Classroom observations did not fully support the teacher's self report data which leads to the conclusion that perhaps the teachers do not know how to conduct IWT properly or that they are changing it to meet the needs of their students. The observations occurred late enough in the school year that we would expect to see a list of "Must Dos" and "May Dos" plus the teacher working with individual students or small groups of students while this is occurring. For second grade, IWT was observed in 44% of the classrooms. It ranged from 27 to 91 minutes with an average of 43 minutes. This was an increase from last year when it was only observed in 25% of the second grade classrooms. In third grade, IWT was observed in only 24% of the classrooms; however, like second grade last year, they are mostly new to the program. The amount of time

ranged from 20 to 80 minutes, with an average of 37 minutes. The following is an example of a good third grade IWT:

> The students had a "Must Do" list and a "May Do" list to guide their activities.
> Must Do
> 1. Reread current Anthology story
> 2. List new vocabulary (find at least seven)
> 3. Finish page 69 (2 paragraphs on your invention)
>
> May Do
> 1. Spider Spelling
> 2. Reading
> 3. Writer's Workshop
> 4. Word Games
> 5. Fluency

All of these activities were related to Open Court and the current theme and/or story. During this time the teacher also worked with two small groups as the other students worked on their lists. The teacher conducted a lesson reviewing reading comprehension strategies with the first group, using the current Anthology story. With the second group, the teacher conducted a lesson on the elements of persuasive writing, during which he/she modeled what the students should be thinking about when reading the story. (This was a follow-up/extension of a prior lesson.)

Using the Success for All Tutoring Component

The Success for All program includes one-to-one daily tutoring for primary students who need intervention. The tutoring is designed to reinforce the instruction occurring during Success for All time. First priority for tutoring is for 30% of the lowest first graders. As financial resources are available, 20% of the lowest second graders and 10% of the lowest third graders also receive tutoring.

Only 64% of the Success for All teachers said that they sent their students to the Success for All Tutoring Program. Unfortunately, 27% said there was no space available

to send the students who needed it. Both first grade teachers sent their students to tutoring, three second grade teachers sent them but one indicated there wasn't enough space, and two third grade teachers sent students, two said there was no space and one said it wasn't necessary. Five teachers felt that the tutoring benefited some of their students but one felt it did not. One stated, "Yes, I've seen tremendous progress." Another felt it helped some of his/her students but that additional tutors are needed so more students can receive this intervention.

Open Court Observation Data

The following four sections describe what was observed in Open Court classrooms. Observation data is separated by grade level.

Kindergarten. This is the children's first experience with the Open Court program. The primary goal is to introduce the students to literacy. They must learn the alphabet and how it works, the connections between sounds with letters, and how sounds work together. The teacher must read aloud to the pupils and the pupils must read Predecodables and Decodables when they are ready. The teacher should model reading to the class emphasizing print awareness as well as comprehension skills and strategies. Beginning writing should also be taught here.

For Open Court 2000 classrooms observers noted whether teachers taught from the green section, the red section, and the blue section as well as what they did during IWT. There were 21 Open Court 2000 classrooms. Teachers (95%) were most likely to be doing lessons from the green section. All but one teacher engaged in preparing to read activities. This was not true of the other two sections. During our observations, only seven (33%) did activities in the red section and nine (43%) did lessons in the blue

section. IWT looked different in different classrooms. In many classrooms it was a time for students to go to different centers. In other classrooms, it was a time for students to rotate through small groups with the teacher and other adults.

Based on 27 Collections for Young Scholars and Open Court 2000 classrooms, all of the teachers did "alphabetics." Frequent examples of activities were letter-sound correspondence, learning the alphabet (e.g., singing the alphabet song or reciting the alphabet), and blending. Twenty-four of the classrooms (89%) spent time reading for fluency with reading aloud in unison with the teacher occurring the most frequently. Twenty-five of the teachers (93%) spent time on a reading comprehension activity such as asking comprehension questions, learning vocabulary words from the story, and connecting the story to prior knowledge. Many teachers (70%) were also often seen reviewing print awareness during a reading activity.

Overall, kindergarten teachers switched classroom activities frequently. The teacher typically started the day with oral language development such as calendar activities, counting, singing, the pledge of allegiance, roll call, and sharing. Teachers were observed reviewing the Open Court sound/spelling cards and often had the students sing alphabet songs. Teachers usually focused on one letter/sound, reviewing it and conducting follow-up activities like listing words, identifying the sound in words, and completing worksheets from the Reading and Writing Workbook. Teachers frequently read to the students and modeled and worked on comprehension skills and strategies. Students were seen browsing stories and making predictions based on the illustrations. At this level, there was not a lot of reading for fluency; however, the students were asked to read word lists, individual words or sentences in a story, or echo the teacher reading.

As expected, the most common reading activity was the teacher reading aloud to the students (78%). Twenty-six classrooms (96%) did some sort of writing. At this level, this could be anything from coloring to writing individual letters, words, or strings of words. The most common writing activities were drawing/coloring (93%) or working on a worksheet (85%). Teachers and students were observed sometimes working on a shared writing activity to develop writing skills beyond their present individual writing capabilities. Most of the classroom instruction was spent on reading/language arts followed by mathematics. School days typically ended with a description of the homework, which was usually related to the activities that occurred during class.

First Grade. The skills taught in kindergarten should be expanded in first grade. Phonemic awareness skills should be strengthened and students should be taught systematic sound/spelling associations. Teachers must still read aloud but students should be developing reading fluency and they should be exposed to authentic literature. They also should be developing more fluency in writing, writing sentences instead of just letters or words.

For Open Court 2000 classrooms observers recorded if teachers taught from the green section, the red section, and the blue section as well as what they did during IWT. There were 16 Open Court 2000 classrooms. Teachers were most likely to be doing lessons from the red section (88%), closely followed by the green section (81%). Only 44% of the teachers did activities from the blue section. Again, IWT varied from centers to independent work activities.

All of the 21 teachers did alphabetics, reading for fluency, and reading comprehension activities. All of the teachers were seen conducting blending activities.

Working on letter-sound correspondence was also seen in most classrooms. Students were often seen either reading silently or in unison. In almost every classroom, the observers witnessed the students answering comprehension questions (100%) and building vocabulary from the story (95%). Other common activities were connecting the story to prior knowledge or conducting an activity related to the story.

Classrooms were seen participating in reading/language arts activities followed by mathematics. Even though the teacher still frequently read to the students (71%), the students were now seen doing more reading [e.g., reading silently during a lesson (81%), reading when they finished an assignment early (81%), taking turns reading aloud (76%), reading in unison (67%), and doing Sustained Silent Reading (67%)]. All of the classrooms also did some sort of writing. Like kindergarten this was typically drawing/coloring and working on a worksheet; however, students were also often seen writing in their journals. Oral language activities were common as were reviewing print awareness, studying grammar, and working on word definitions and putting the words into sentences. Similar to kindergarten, the homework was an extension of the daily lessons.

Second Grade. In second grade there should be a big shift from focusing on learning sounds and letters to reading for fluency and comprehension. However, previous topics should be reviewed and retaught as necessary. Blending should still be a daily routine and Decodables should still be used for practice and building fluency.

There are 16 Open Court classrooms that were observed in both 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. Eleven classrooms were using Open Court 2000 in 2001-2002 and ten were using it in 2000-2001. One teacher changed from Collections for Young Scholars to

Open Court 2000. In both years, the teachers using Open Court 2000 were more likely to do lessons from the red section (82% and 73% respectively). During 2000-2001, the green and blue sections were conducted equally (55%); however, during 2001-2002, many more teachers conducted lessons from the blue section (64%) as compared to the green section (27%). As mentioned in a previous section, there was an increase in teachers conducting IWT (25% to 44%) from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002.

Based on the observations in 16 Collections for Young Scholars and Open Court 2000 classrooms, all of the teachers had the students read for fluency and all but one had the students work on reading comprehension. This was similar for both years. Students were seen reading aloud or reading silently. In a few instances fluency tests were witnessed. Observers most frequently saw teachers teaching vocabulary from the story and asking questions to ensure text understanding (reading comprehension lessons). Teachers were also observed teaching a variety of other comprehension skills and strategies but not as often. Although less important at this grade level, most also worked on some sort of alphabetics, 94% in 2000-2001 and 75% in 2001-2002.

During both years, reading/language arts was the topic most frequently taught followed by mathematics. During 2000-2001, students were often seen taking turns reading (75%) or reading silently during a lesson (81%). The following year these two activities were also frequently observed (88% and 94% respectively), but so was Sustained Silent Reading (69%) or reading when the student finished with a lesson (81%). Almost all of the teachers (88%) did some sort of writing activity in 2000-2001 but they all did writing in 2001-2002. During 2000-2001, this was typically working on a worksheet (81%), whereas in 2001-2002 doing worksheets, drawing/coloring, and writing

in journals (69% each) were all commonly seen. During both years, the teachers gave homework, extending the lessons conducted during class time.

Third Grade. Third grade should be a continuation of the activities in second grade. Again the focus should be on fluency and comprehension. Observations were conducted in 39 Open Court classrooms (36 Open Court 2000 and 3 Collections for Young Scholars). In the Open Court 2000 classrooms, 50% were seen conducting a lesson from the green section. The most commonly observed activity was working on building vocabulary. Twenty-nine classrooms (81%) did an activity from the red section. As expected, this was typically the students reading aloud and working on comprehension skills and strategies. Twenty-two teachers (61%) conducted a lesson from the blue section. As previously mentioned, only 24% of the classrooms were seen conducting IWT according to the guidelines.

Based on observations in all 39 classrooms, 59% did alphabetics, 100% read for fluency, and 97% conducted comprehension activities. Alphabetics was frequently blending or reviewing individual letters. Reading for fluency was typically reading aloud or reading silently. Comprehension activities commonly included the teacher asking the students comprehension questions or learning vocabulary from the story. Making connections to prior knowledge, summarizing, and making predictions were also frequently observed.

Reading/language arts was the most frequently taught subject followed by mathematics. Although the teacher was still often seen reading to the students (62%), in almost every classroom, the students were seen reading silently during a lesson (95%). The students were also frequently seen taking turns reading aloud (74%) or reading when

done with their work (69%). Writing was seen in all of the classrooms but the lessons were not always Open Court. There were a variety of writing activities observed but the most frequently seen were working on a worksheet (85%) or editing (69%). Almost all of the classrooms (97%) were also seen working on word definitions. Similar to the other grade levels, the students received homework related to their instructional activities that day.

In conclusion, all of the grade levels met and exceeded the required amount of time on reading/language arts. In fact, teachers were most likely to spend their time on reading/language arts followed by mathematics. As required, most of the program materials were displayed in the classrooms; however, the Concept/Question Board and the Inquiry area were still not often seen and therefore, not often used. Teachers reported, and observers confirmed, that they were unable to complete all of the daily lessons and often finished them the next day. In turn, this resulted in them falling behind on the district's pacing plan for the school year. It is important to note that in most classrooms the observers saw little wasted time but teachers were still having a hard time completing all of the daily lessons. As they mentioned, they needed to make accommodations in the program to meet the needs of all of their students. The observation uncovered differences in section completion depending on the grade level. For instance, in kindergarten teachers were more likely to conduct lessons from the green section and in grades 1-3 teachers were more likely to conduct lessons from the red section. Similar to last year, teachers often did not get to the blue section. Some teachers were also not able to conduct IWT; however, based on a comparison with the same second grade teachers, there was an increase from 2000-2001 to 2001-2002. Also,

alphabetics was most often taught in the early grades but reading for fluency and comprehension activities were seen in all four grade levels. Writing was seen in almost every classroom; however, it wasn't always an Open Court lesson.

Success for All Observation Data

The following three sections describe what was observed in Success for All classrooms. Unfortunately, there were only two Early Learning and two Roots classrooms so generalizability is limited. Descriptions of these classrooms will be provided. However, the Wings program was seen in 10 second and third grade classrooms so percentages of activities will be presented.

Early Learning In Kindergarten, the whole day is devoted to the Success for All Early Learning Program. The Early Learning Program is a thematically-based integrated curriculum that promotes, develops, and enhances oral language, literacy, listening, numeracy, creative expression, positive self-esteem, and social skills. The core of the program is the five cooperative learning standards: 1. Practice active listening; 2. Help and encourage each other; 3. Everyone participates; 4. Explain your ideas and tell why; and 5. Complete tasks. These are taught and practiced starting in kindergarten but play an important part of every grade level. Their purpose is to create and maintain an effective cooperative-learning classroom environment. The Early Learning components are: Thematic Units, Phonemic Awareness, Letter Investigations, Emergent Writing, Story Telling and Retelling (STaR), Shared Book Experience, Eager to Read, Math, Learning Centers, and Peabody Language Development/Language Links. KinderRoots begins during the second half of the school year and replaces Eager to Read. The following is a brief description of each of the components. There are 10 science and

social studies themes that were selected so students can learn to make connections between what they learn and the world around them. Each theme usually takes three to four weeks to complete. The learning of concepts and subject areas around each theme begins at the students' level of familiarity and then progresses to more complex learning as the students' progress through the theme. Students receive lessons in phonemic awareness, letter investigation, and writing as part of their day. Students are taught how to recognize sounds in words and to be able to manipulate them (Phonemic Awareness) and that the alphabet as well as print is all around us (Letter Investigation). Learning how to write is a developmental process starting with scribbling and drawing and progressing to writing. The goals of writing in the Early Learning Program are to motivate and promote writing, to engage students in the writing process, and to convey to the students that they are all writers. Three specific Success for All activities center on reading. STaR introduces students to age appropriate literature. It enhances oral language, increases vocabulary and comprehension development, and promotes love for reading. Shared Book Experience teaches children about literacy, concepts of print through use of big books/enlarged text with predictable story lines, and provides time for independent reading. Eager to Read is a series of 31 simple, theme-related stories, each with a big book that develops print awareness and encourages reading-like behaviors. Math lessons should be integrated with the theme. It may be part of small/large group lessons, Learning Centers, or the calendar activity because of time limitations. Math lessons reinforce the theme learning essentials in each Early Learning thematic unit. However, it is not a comprehensive math curriculum and therefore teachers must supplement these lessons with their appropriate math curriculum. Students should spend

time at Learning Centers every day for 30 to 45 minutes, working independently and interacting with other students. There should be a minimum of seven centers and the students should have some choice in the activities they do. The center tasks should be related to the theme and include a writing activity. The final piece is Peabody Language Development or Language Links, which promotes oral language and cognitive development. Each of these activities should occur every day. There is also time in the class schedule to conduct lessons not covered above (Specials).

Both classrooms were observed implementing the Success for All program. In one classroom the theme was dinosaurs and in the other classroom the observer was unable to determine the theme. Both classrooms did blending and one did Letter Investigation. Both had writing activities that included both drawing/coloring and sentence writing. For example, one teacher had the class working simultaneously on three different levels of writing. The first group colored in a picture of a queen, cut out the pieces, and glued them to construction paper. The second group colored in a picture of a butterfly and made up or recited a rhyme about butterflies. The third group colored in the word blue (hollow letters) and wrote two sentences with the word blue in it. This shows three levels of writing activities based on student development.

Both teachers read to the students and asked them questions. Neither classroom had center time, although one of the classrooms had different classroom activities to do during recess that was similar to centers. In both rooms the only math related activity was part of the calendar activity. Oral language development was an important part of instruction in both classrooms and could be witnessed throughout the day. One class spent a lot of time on non-Success for All activities (e.g., Sustained Silent Reading,

Physical Education, and working on a Mother's Day present). The other teacher spent only a few minutes explaining how to read a clock, prompted by the students' inability to tell the teacher what time it was.

Both teachers did alphabetics, reading for fluency, and reading for comprehension with the students but to different degrees. One did only blending but the other did several alphabetic activities centering on the letter "Q," blending, and rhyming. One teacher started the day with eight minutes of reading for fluency (Sustained Silent Reading). The observer felt some children seemed to be actually reading whereas others just looked at the illustrations. The students read aloud from a book echoing the teacher, read a poem, and read their spelling words in unison. The second teacher had the students read the morning message and sentences from the board but no literature was read. Listening for comprehension was prominent in both classes. One teacher read to the students and checked comprehension on two occasions. The other teacher started the lesson by activating prior knowledge about dinosaurs before reading them a book and asking them questions. Later this same teacher reviewed the author and illustrator, discussed vocabulary, and asked the students questions from another story. And in a third story, children listened to a tape while the teacher showed them pictures and asked them questions. To summarize, one teacher focused primarily on alphabetics and fluency while the other focused more on comprehension.

Roots. For 90 minutes Success for All students attend a Reading Roots class. This may be with their homeroom teacher or with another teacher at the school. The classroom may be composed of the same grade level students or a mixture of different grade levels. The 90-minute class should consist of three sections: STaR (Story Telling

and Retelling); Reading Roots; and Peabody Language Development/Language Links. The teacher starts with STaR for 20 minutes followed by a Reading Roots Shared Story Lesson for 50 minutes, and then oral language for the remaining 20 minutes. STaR is an interactive story-reading program. Students build oral language skills through the reading, discussing, and retelling of good literature. The focus of STaR is comprehension. Reading Roots consists of the following sections: Showtime, Letter Activity, Story Activity, and Celebration. On the first day of a cycle of lessons, there is also an activity called Setting the Stage. The goals of Reading Roots are to develop independent readers, to offer opportunities to practice reading, and to teach decoding and comprehension skills. According to the program guidelines, the goal of Peabody Language Development/ Language Links is to "...stimulate oral language, writing, and cognitive development."

Both first grade classrooms were observed implementing Reading Roots. One classroom had only 10 students with a mixture of first, third, and fourth grade students. The third and fourth grade students were identified as ELD 1s (the lowest level). The second classroom had 20 first graders and one student who was a second-grade retained student. At both schools the students start out with their regular teacher, attend the 90-minute Success for All lesson, and then return to their regular teacher. Both teachers started with the STaR lesson and then moved into Reading Roots. The observers did not see evidence of the third component in either class. Both ended with Celebrations (i.e., having a student read aloud or having students read the word wall). However, oral language skills were practiced throughout the first two components. Only one class had a writing activity during Success for All, a worksheet related to the story they were

reading. While both teachers seemed constantly on task during Success for All time, they were unable to complete all of the sections.

Both teachers spent a considerable amount of additional time on other reading/language arts activities (84 minutes and 73 minutes). Students practiced writing during this time. There were several examples of writing activities but no actual writing instruction. Students read stories they wrote for homework aloud and they took spelling tests. Observers also witnessed reading/language arts integrated into both science and math lessons.

Both teachers did alphabetics as part of Success for All. This was typically studying one letter by reviewing the sound, learning how to write it, and identifying what words contain it. The observers witnessed several different approaches to reading for fluency. For instance, students engaged in partner reading, students read a list of words from the story, students did Sustained Silent Reading, and students read a familiar story in unison. Students in both classrooms read literature as well as other kinds of text. They read individually and in unison. One teacher asked comprehension questions and built vocabulary from the story. The second teacher worked on comprehension questions, built vocabulary, had the students make predictions, and activated the students' prior knowledge.

Wings. All of the second and third grade teachers taught Wings during their Success for All class time. Similar to Roots, this is a 90-minute class. Once students have completed the Roots lessons successfully they move on to Wings. Usually students start Wings at the beginning of second grade; however, this varies depending on student progress. Wings builds on the skills learned in Roots. The 90-minute period should

consist of three components: Listening Comprehension (20 minutes), Reading Together (55 minutes), and Book Club/Additional Skills Instruction (15 minutes). During Listening Comprehension, teachers read literature to students from different genres. Listening Comprehension provides opportunities for students to understand the nature of stories, various genres of literature, and the use of literary devices in an interactive format that models strategic reading. Reading Together is broken down further into Story-Related Activities, Direct Instruction in Reading Comprehension, and Two-Minute Edit. It includes reading for fluency, vocabulary, discussions, direct instruction in comprehension, and writing. The Two-Minute Edit consists of sentences or a short paragraph containing errors that the teacher writes or selects. This is a cooperative, small-group activity where students edit and explain why the editing is needed. Two or three days a week the Success for All session closes with Book Club. This can be Sustained Silent Reading or a time to share books the students read at home. On the remaining days, this time is used for additional instruction based on students' needs.

The Success for All classes consisted of 16 to 23 students. In all classrooms but one, it included three to four grade levels. Listening Comprehension was observed in 90% of the classrooms and Reading Together was observed in all of the classrooms. The one classroom that did not do Listening Comprehension spent time on class rules since it was the first day of a new group of Success for All students. Book Club was not seen in every classroom but this is not unexpected since it is not supposed to occur every day. Class time typically consisted of whole group instruction, partner reading/problem solving, and individual work.

Alphabetics was only observed in two classrooms (20%) and it did not occur during Success for All time. These were actually not lessons but rather explanations of how to sound out a word during reading. One would not expect to see alphabetic lessons as these classes had students from the highest Success for All grouping. Reading for fluency was seen in most of the classrooms whereas comprehension activities and writing were seen in all classrooms. Students were frequently observed reading silently or reading with a partner. In every classroom the teacher was seen asking the students comprehension questions. In 80% of the classrooms they worked on vocabulary related to the story and/or did writing related to the story. In over half of the classrooms they related the story to other stories they had read or to prior knowledge, they previewed the story and made predictions, and/or they sequenced the events of the story. Lessons often incorporated several comprehension skills or strategies (i.e., main idea, relate to own experiences, and compare and contrast); however, the teachers usually didn't ask for any higher level of thinking or explanation of answers.

The most common type of writing was completing a worksheet, such as the Treasure Hunt activity. Writing also occurred during non-Success for All time and included writing a thank you letter, editing one's own work, journal writing, and tests. Although reading/language arts was not usually integrated into other subjects except at a minimal level (e.g., reading or writing), there was one good example of an integrated lesson. The following is an example of reading/language arts integrated into Social Studies:

> Students were asked to read silently from their Social Studies book about conservation. Before having the students alternate reading aloud, the teacher asks them what reading strategies they will use. One student responds, "Finding the main idea." Before answering the questions at the end of the chapter the teacher

asks the students what they can do. The student's answer: read the book again, look for the answer in the book, or ask someone else. The teacher explains that one of the questions will take critical thinking skills. The students do the work and the teacher walks around monitoring progress. Before discussing answers, the teacher goes over vocabulary from the chapter. She/he reminds the class that if they come across a word that they don't know they can try to figure it out by reading the sentences before it and after it. The teacher and students go over the answers with the teacher writing one student's answer on the board. The teacher comments that he/she is pleased that the student gave a complete answer and used the question to form her answer. The teacher ends the lesson with an extension of this lesson on conservation. Students must write down four things that trees are used for and illustrate each.

In conclusion, the teachers met and exceeded the required amount of minutes on reading/language arts (K-3) and the teachers spent about 90 minutes of this time on Success for All activities (Roots and Wings). Similar to Open Court, not all of the program materials were displayed and the teachers couldn't always finish their lessons. The Success for All teachers mentioned that they would like more spaces available for their students in the tutoring part of the program. Alphabetics was seen in all kindergarten and first grade classrooms but few of the second and third grade classrooms. However, reading for fluency was seen in most of the classrooms and comprehension and writing activities were seen in all of the classrooms. Similar to Open Court, the teachers were usually not seen wasting instructional time but were unable to complete all of the Success for All lessons. They also mentioned that they made accommodations in the program to meet the needs of all of their students.

3. To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement?

In this section reading program outcomes are assessed by Stanford Achievement Tests Ninth Edition (SAT/9) for the entire district and for the subsample of teachers who were randomly selected for observation. Three tests (Reading, Language, and Spelling) and reading subtests (Word Reading, Reading Vocabulary,[8] and Reading Comprehension) were included in these analyses. For this evaluation, adjusted NCE[9] gain scores (adjusting for pre-existing difference among students) provide a meaningful measure of academic progress.

Both student variables [such as ethnicity, language status, and English Language Development (ELD) level] and teacher variables (such as years of service and teacher credential status) were analyzed in relation to students' outcomes.

Finally, for a subset of our sample using the Open Court reading program, the impact of instructional variables and program implementation on student outcomes were examined. It was not possible to explore the impact of classroom and instructional program on student' outcomes for Success for All students due to the high frequency of students' rotation with different teachers during the school year.

Evaluation Questions

The general research question: "*To what extent is the District Reading Plan affecting achievement?*" is translated to the following specific evaluation questions:

1. How do Open Court program students achieve compared to Success for All program students?

---

[8] At the first grade level it is Word Reading and at the second and third grade levels it is Reading Vocabulary.

[9] NCE score stands for Normal Curve Equivalent score, which has a normal distribution with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21 (Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition, Technical Manual).

2. What is the impact of Open Court and Success for All on student achievement?
3. What percentage of each group of students is literate? (The criterion for considering a student literate was scoring at the 50th percentile or higher on Reading, Language, and Spelling as measured by SAT/9.)
4. Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact for different ethnic groups?
5. Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact for students with different language classifications?
6. Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact for students with different ELD levels?
7. Does teacher experience impact student achievement?
8. Does teacher permanency impact student achievement?
9. What are the Open Court implementation factors that impact student outcomes?

Findings

Data to answer the above evaluation questions were obtained from three main sources: Student Information System (SIS), the district's employee database, and classroom observations. In the following sections of this report each specific question will be answered respectively.

How do Open Court program students achieve compared to Success for All program students?

2000-2001 Achievement Data. Tables 21 and 22 present the year 2000-2001 achievement data for Open Court and Success for All reading programs by grade level. The SAT/9 was given in Spring 2001, after a majority of students had been exposed to the reading programs for at least six months. (Some of these students may have benefited from these programs for a longer period of time). However, since we do not have any data at the beginning of the program we cannot attribute student achievement to their respective reading programs alone. Individual differences related to reading abilities at the beginning of the program are also important elements affecting student progress. Measures selected for reading/language arts achievement are Reading, Reading Subtests, Language, and Spelling. The major findings drawn from these tables are:

- 2000-2001 first and second grade Open Court program students had higher test scores than Success for All students in all subject areas when analyzed for the district and sample teachers.
- Sample teachers' average scores are very close to the district average with minor variation. This finding validates our sampling process and allows us to generalize from sample data to the whole district.

Overall, Open Court students scored higher than Success for All students across grades (first and second), all tests (Reading, Word Reading, Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Language, and Spelling), and both groups (district and sample teachers).

Table 21.
First Grade Spring 2001 NCE Scores

Population/ Sample	Subject Tested	Open Court			Success for All		
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
District	Reading	48,329	53.41	19.73	4,219	42.46	17.92
	Word Reading	50,075	54.46	21.09	4,531	43.62	20.32
	Reading Comprehension	49,462	51.84	18.73	4,403	42.88	17.11
	Language	48,355	47.50	19.97	4,299	40.40	17.69
	Spelling	49,879	53.95	24.03	4,523	39.00	20.54
Sample Teachers	Reading	264	51.69	18.85	66	45.29	17.63
	Word Reading	273	54.03	19.99	70	46.29	21.09
	Reading Comprehension	265	50.58	17.85	70	44.46	16.31
	Language	268	44.63	18.59	70	39.35	17.55
	Spelling	273	53.12	22.63	72	40.31	20.34

Table 22.
Second Grade Spring 2001 NCE Scores

Population/ Sample	Subject Tested	Open Court			Success for All		
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
District	Reading	53,627	43.11	18.00	4,806	35.22	16.04
	Reading Vocabulary	54,791	41.55	22.27	4,977	32.77	20.83
	Reading Comprehension	56,264	42.08	16.77	5,215	36.36	15.53
	Language	55,422	44.02	22.37	5,107	36.42	20.50
	Spelling	55,995	47.72	20.94	5,190	38.91	18.72
Sample Teachers	Reading	577	46.20	16.76	86	35.66	14.55
	Reading Vocabulary	585	45.42	19.54	92	33.20	18.63
	Reading Comprehension	604	43.52	15.63	95	37.85	15.23
	Language	593	47.98	21.25	94	36.30	18.55
	Spelling	602	51.10	18.38	95	39.47	16.63

What is the impact of Open Court and Success for All on student achievement?

Adjusted NCE gain scores were used to compare the impact of each reading program on students' reading/language arts achievement. This will eliminate the initial differences between the two programs. These comparisons are made at the district level and at the sample teachers level for second and third grade students.[10]

Spring 2001 to Spring 2002 Adjusted Gain Scores. Adjusted gain scores for matched groups of students are presented in Tables 23 and 24 for the district and the teachers selected from the sample. The following conclusions can be drawn from the adjusted gain scores comparing the Open Court and Success for All programs:

- At the district level, Open Court students significantly outperformed Success for All students in all subject areas across grades; however, the effect size values are relatively small ranging from 0.04 to 0.24.[11] The only educationally meaningful differences were in second grade Reading Vocabulary and third grade Reading Comprehension and Spelling.
- At the teacher level, for second grade the only statistically significant and educationally meaningful differences were in Reading Vocabulary and Language. However, the Open Court adjusted gain averages were equivalent or higher than adjusted gain averages for Success for All on the other tests. In third grade, the only statistically significant and educationally meaningful difference found between the two programs was for Spelling in favor of Open

[10] Since kindergarten students are not required to take SAT/9 there are no gain scores for first grade students.

[11] Effect size is a powerful measure of program impact not affected by sample size, a major contributing factor for probability level of significance. According to Cohen (1994), 0.20 is considered a small effect size, 0.50 is considered medium, and 0.80 is considered large.

Court. For Reading, Reading Vocabulary, and Language the NCE adjusted gains were higher for Success for All but were not significant. The Reading Comprehension gain score was higher for Open Court but not significant. The overall findings support the effectiveness of the Open Court program in comparison to the Success for All program; however, the differential gains were small. The effect size values were either not educationally meaningful or were relatively small (.04 to .24). At the district level, the only educationally meaningful differences were in Reading Vocabulary (second grade), Reading Comprehension (third grade), and Spelling (third grade). There were minor variations for the teacher sample.

Table 23.
Second Grade Adjusted NCE Gain Score

Population/ Sample	Subject Tested	Open Court			Success for All			Effect Size
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
District	Reading	43,633	-.01*	1.04	3,808	-.13	1.01	0.12
	Reading Vocabulary	45,594	-.05*	1.11	4,127	-.30	1.12	0.23
	Reading Comprehension	46,074	-.12*	1.03	4,174	-.16	1.05	0.04
	Language	44,824	-.03*	1.10	3,973	-.27	1.08	0.12
	Spelling	46,262	-.03*	1.04	4,234	-.14	1.04	0.11
Sample Teachers	Reading	251	.14	1.22	63	-.03	.91	0.15
	Reading Vocabulary	266	.10*	1.18	69	-.47	1.13	0.49
	Reading Comprehension	259	-.04	1.31	69	-.04	1.04	0.00
	Language	260	.16*	1.36	70	-.17	.97	0.26
	Spelling	267	.03	1.14	72	-.16	1.06	0.17

* Indicates that the Open Court reading program average NCE gain score is higher than the Success for All reading program average NCE gain score at $p<0.05$ level of significance ($P<0.05$ means that the probability of this difference happening by chance alone is less than 5%).

Table 24.
Third Grade Adjusted NCE Gain Score

Population/ Sample	Subject Tested	Open Court			Success for All			Effect Size
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
District	Reading	43,053	-.02*	.95	3,706	-.12	.94	0.11
	Reading Vocabulary	43,801	.04*	.86	3,808	-.06	.91	0.12
	Reading Comprehension	45,014	.10*	.93	4,005	-.11	.91	0.23
	Language	43,979	.02*	.89	3,885	-.09	.87	0.12
	Spelling	44,805	.05*	.96	3,992	-.18	.96	0.24
Sample Teachers	Reading	623	-.07	.92	82	.05	.89	0.13
	Reading Vocabulary	629	-.01	.91	87	.09	.87	0.11
	Reading Comprehension	648	.02	.86	91	-.09	.86	0.13
	Language	638	-.06	.84	82	.02	.76	0.10
	Spelling	647	.03*	.95	89	-.28	.84	0.33

* Indicates that the Open Court reading program average NCE gain score is higher than the Success for All reading program average NCE gain score at $p<0.05$ level of significance.

What percentage of the students for each group is considered literate?

As mentioned previously, the goal of the District Reading Plan is literacy for all students by third grade. A literate student is defined by program staff as a student who scores at the 50th percentile or higher on all three tests of Reading, Language, and Spelling. Based on this definition, districtwide 38% of the first grade students, 31% of the second grade students, and 25% of the third grade students can be considered literate regardless of their reading program. Table 25 presents the percentage of literate students by grade level and program (Open Court and Success for All) for the district and the sample teachers. At the district level, the percentage of Open Court literate students is about twice as high as for Success for All students for all grades. This pattern is similar for the sample teachers.

Table 25.
Percentage of First- to Third-Grade Students Considered Literate[12] by Program

Population/ Sample	Grade	Program	Percent
District	1	Open Court	38.6
		Success for All	19.5
	2	Open Court	31.2
		Success for All	15.4
	3	Open Court	24.2
		Success for All	12.8
Sample Teachers	1	Open Court	46.1
		Success for All	16.2
	2	Open Court	37.8
		Success for All	15.8
	3	Open Court	21.3
		Success for All	8.2

[12] Students scoring at the 50th percentile or higher on Reading, Language, and Spelling are considered literate.

Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact for different ethnic groups?

A factorial Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) approach was used to examine the relationship between reading programs (Open Court vs. Success for All) and ethnicity (Black vs. Hispanic) and individual student achievement gains. The main reason for not including other ethnic groups in the analyses was the small number of students especially in the Success for All reading program. Descriptive statistics for these analyses are presented in Tables 26 and 27 for each grade. These analyses test two hypotheses:

- Is there a significant difference between Black and Hispanic student gains?
- Does any difference persist when controlling for program type?

The results of the analyses indicated that:

- Although there were significant differences for adjusted gains between Black and Hispanic students favoring Hispanic students, the effect sizes were too small for the differences to be considered educationally important (see Table 26).
- When controlling for type of program, Hispanic students continued to generally outperform Black students in second grade in both Open Court and Success for All, and in third grade in Success for All. Third grade Open Court showed no systematic difference in gains between Black and Hispanic students (see Table 27).

Table 26.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Ethnicity

	Blacks			Hispanics			Effect Size
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
2nd Grade							
Reading	4,722	-.15	1.06	36,727	-.03*	1.04	0.12
Reading Vocabulary	5,085	-.08	1.15	38,439	-.14	1.10	0.05
Reading Comprehension	5,179	-.30	1.06	38,847	-.12*	1.02	0.18
Language	4,953	-.21	1.11	37,808	-.08*	1.10	0.12
Spelling	5,177	-.16	1.08	39,078	-.05*	1.04	0.11
3rd Grade							
Reading	4,731	-.05	1.00	36,061	-.09	.92	0.04
Reading Vocabulary	4,884	.08*	.89	36,696	-.01	.86	0.09
Reading Comprehension	5,059	-.01	.98	37,824	.02*	.89	0.03
Language	4,860	-.07	.91	36,974	-.02*	.88	0.05
Spelling	5,036	-.01	.97	37,636	-.00	.96	0.01

* Indicates that the Hispanic students' average NCE gain score is significantly different from the Black students at $p<0.05$ level of significance.

Table 27.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Program and Ethnicity

	Open Court						Success for All					
Tests	Blacks			Hispanics			Blacks			Hispanics		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
2nd Grade												
Reading	4,367	-.14	1.06	33,374	-.02	1.04	355	-.33	1.02	3,353	-.11	1.01
Reading Vocabulary	4,683	-.05	1.15	34,819	-.13	1.10	402	-.37	1.16	3,620	-.31	1.11
Reading Comprehension	4,769	-.30	1.06	35,189	-.12	1.02	410	-.36	1.06	3,658	-.14	1.05
Language	4,573	-.19	1.12	34,314	-.06	1.10	380	-.41	1.07	3,494	-.25	1.08
Spelling	4,765	-.15	1.08	35,362	-.04	1.04	412	-.24	1.07	3,716	-.12	1.04
3rd Grade												
Reading	4,414	-.04	1.00	32,769	-.08	.91	317	-.18	1.02	3,292	-.12	.93
Reading Vocabulary	4,547	.09	.88	33,325	-.00	.85	337	.01	1.01	3,371	-.08	.90
Reading Comprehension	4,698	.01	.98	34,287	.03	.89	361	-.22	.97	3,537	-.10	.90
Language	4,525	-.05	.91	33,528	-.01	.88	335	-.26	.87	3,446	-.08	.87
Spelling	4,674	.00	.97	34,110	.02	.96	362	-.19	.99	3,526	-.18	.95

Note. Interaction effect sizes are in the Appendix for Tables 27, 29, and 33.

Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact on students with different language classifications?

A factorial Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) approach was used to examine the relationship between reading programs (Open Court vs. Success for All) and English language classification (English Only vs. Limited English Proficient) and individual student gains. Descriptive statistics for these analyses are presented in Tables 28 and 29 for each grade. The analyses test two hypotheses:

- Is there a significant difference between English Only (EO) students and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students?
- Does any difference persist when controlling for program type?

Second grade EO students have an educationally important higher gain average in Reading Vocabulary than do the LEP students. No other educationally meaningful differences were found between the two groups on the other tests. Third grade EO students have an educationally important higher gain in Reading, Reading Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension than their LEP peers. No other educationally meaningful differences were found for Language and Spelling but the direction of the relative gains favors EO students (see Table 28).

When controlling for program type, EO students continued to outperform LEP students in Open Court. In Success for All, the same relationship generally held for third graders, but second grade LEP students exhibited larger gains than EO students in Reading, Reading Comprehension, and Spelling (see Table 29).

Table 28.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Language Proficiency

	English Only			Limited English Proficiency			Effect Size
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
2nd Grade							
Reading	11,990	.00	1.05	30,943	-.04	1.04	0.04
Reading Vocabulary	12,682	.11*	1.12	32,339	-.19	1.10	0.27
Reading Comprehension	12,800	-.15	1.06	32,729	-.13*	1.02	0.02
Language	12,361	-.01	1.09	31,857	-.09	1.11	0.07
Spelling	12,840	-.07	1.02	32,926	-.04*	1.05	0.03
3rd Grade							
Reading	11,829	.14*	1.01	27,644	-.15	.91	0.28
Reading Vocabulary	12,086	.19*	.86	28,157	-.06	.88	0.25
Reading Comprehension	12,421	.24*	1.02	29,022	-.07	.87	0.30
Language	12,033	.05	.90	28,420	-.04	.88	0.09
Spelling	12,361	.04	.94	28,890	-.03	.98	0.07

* Indicates that the English Only (EO) students' average NCE gain score is significantly different from the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at $p<0.05$ level of significance.

Table 29.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Program and Language Proficiency

Tests	Open Court						Success for All					
	English Only			Limited English Proficiency			English Only			Limited English Proficiency		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
2nd Grade												
Reading	11,347	.02	1.05	28,079	-.03	1.05	643	-.25	1.02	2,864	-.12	1.02
Reading Vocabulary	11,967	.14	1.12	29,246	-.17	1.10	715	-.25	1.17	3,093	-.35	1.10
Reading Comprehension	12,086	-.14	1.06	29,585	-.13	1.02	714	-.27	1.09	3,144	-.15	1.05
Language	11,678	.00	1.09	28,882	-.07	1.11	683	-.29	1.06	2,975	-.28	1.09
Spelling	12,107	-.06	1.03	29,746	-.03	1.05	733	-.18	.99	3,180	-.13	1.06
3rd Grade												
Reading	11,235	.15	1.01	25,070	-.15	.91	594	-.10	1.05	2,574	-.19	.92
Reading Vocabulary	11,462	.20	.85	25,520	-.05	.87	624	.02	.98	2,637	-.12	.92
Reading Comprehension	11,758	.26	1.02	26,242	-.06	.86	663	-.11	1.00	2,780	-.18	.88
Language	11,411	.06	.90	25,710	-.04	.89	622	-.14	.89	2,710	-.11	.86
Spelling	11,702	.05	.93	26,115	-.01	.98	659	-.21	1.01	2,775	-.21	.95

Do Open Court and Success for All have the same impact on students with different English Language Development levels?

Based on the level of their English language development, English learners are classified into five levels. ELD levels I and II are students with limited knowledge of English language and ELD levels III and IV are at a moderate level of English language development. ELD level V students are considered proficient in the English language and are in the process of being classified as a Redesignated English Fluent Proficient (RFEP) student and therefore excluded from the analyses.

Moderate ELD level (III & IV) students outperformed the lower level ELD (I & II) students in all areas across both grades. Educationally meaningful differences were found for second grade Reading Vocabulary and Language and for third grade Reading Comprehension and Spelling. To examine the interaction between reading program participation and level of English language development, a factorial Analysis of Variance design was utilized. There were no significant interactions between ELD levels and program type. The same relationship favoring ELD levels III and IV students existed across both programs. Table 30 presents the descriptive statistics by ELD levels and Table 31 presents a breakdown of the gain score by both program and ELD levels.

Table 30.
Adjusted NCE Gain by ELD Level

	ELD Level I & II			ELD Level III & IV			Effect Size
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
2nd Grade							
Reading	19,450	-.08	1.08	10,898	.04*	.98	0.11
Reading Vocabulary	20,496	-.31	1.14	11,226	.01*	1.00	0.29
Reading Comprehension	20,795	-.17	1.03	11,305	-.06*	1.00	0.11
Language	20,191	-.21	1.13	11,051	.11*	1.05	0.29
Spelling	20,941	-.09	1.08	11,353	.05*	1.00	0.13
3rd Grade							
Reading	8,245	-.28	.93	18,502	-.11*	.90	0.19
Reading Vocabulary	8,454	-.17	.95	18,795	-.01*	.84	0.18
Reading Comprehension	8,755	-.23	.86	19,334	-.01*	.86	0.26
Language	8,530	-.14	.87	18,969	-.01*	.89	0.15
Spelling	8,727	-.19	1.00	19,233	.03*	.96	0.23

* Indicates that the ELD Level I & II students' average NCE gain score is significantly different from the ELD Level III & IV students at $p<0.05$ level of significance.

Table 31.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Program and ELD Level

Tests	Open Court						Success for All					
	ELD Level I & II			ELD Level III & IV			ELD Level I & II			ELD Level III & IV		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
2nd Grade												
Reading	17,597	-.07	1.08	9,919	.05	.98	1,853	-.16	1.06	979	-.03	.93
Reading Vocabulary	18,460	-.29	1.14	10,202	.02	1.00	2,036	-.45	1.14	1,024	-.15	.99
Reading Comprehension	18,722	-.17	1.03	10,270	-.06	1.00	2,073	-.21	1.08	1,035	-.04	.98
Language	18,241	-.19	1.13	10,058	.13	1.05	1,950	-.40	1.10	993	-.07	1.05
Spelling	18,831	-.08	1.08	10,316	.06	1.00	2,110	-.19	1.10	1,037	.00	.97
3rd Grade												
Reading	7,460	-.28	.93	16,768	-.10	.90	785	-.31	.95	1,734	-.15	.89
Reading Vocabulary	7,644	-.17	.95	17,025	-.00	.83	810	-.20	.97	1,770	-.09	.90
Reading Comprehension	7,893	-.22	.85	17,477	.00	.86	862	-.33	.88	1,857	-.12	.86
Language	7,704	-.14	.87	17,144	-.00	.89	826	-.21	.86	1,825	-.08	.86
Spelling	7,863	-.18	1.00	17,383	.05	.97	864	-.30	1.03	1,850	-.18	.92

Does teacher experience impact student reading achievement? Are more experienced teachers more effective in one program compared to the other?

Although there is a significant correlation between teacher years of experience and student gains, the magnitude of it is very small ($r < .1$). Teacher years of experience does not account for a meaningful amount of change in gain scores.

Does teacher permanency impact student reading achievement? Are permanent teachers more effective in one program compared to the other?

Table 32 clearly indicates that permanent credentialed teachers have a positive impact on student achievement. For permanent teachers the adjusted gain score is positive for all tests across grades except for second grade Reading Comprehension. For non-permanent teachers the adjusted gain is negative for both grades across all subjects. Students with permanent teachers scored significantly higher than students with non-permanent teachers across tests and grades. However, none of the differences were large enough to have practical importance. It is worth noting that this relationship favoring permanent teachers persisted when we controlled for program type (see Table 33).

Table 32.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Teacher Status

	Permanent Teachers			Other Teachers			Effect Size
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
2nd Grade							
Reading	26,089	.04*	1.04	21,352	-.08	1.03	0.12
Reading Vocabulary	27,269	.01*	1.11	22,452	-.17	1.10	0.16
Reading Comprehension	27,544	-.07*	1.03	22,704	-.18	1.02	0.11
Language	26,679	.04*	1.10	22,118	-.15	1.09	0.17
Spelling	27,687	.01*	1.04	22,809	-.09	1.04	0.10
3rd Grade							
Reading	26,186	.04*	.95	20,573	-.12	.93	0.17
Reading Vocabulary	26,622	.08*	.85	20,987	-.03	.87	0.13
Reading Comprehension	27,397	.16*	.95	21,622	-.02	.90	0.19
Language	26,771	.07*	.89	21,093	-.05	.88	0.14
Spelling	27,224	.07*	.96	21,573	-.02	.97	0.09

* Indicates that the permanent teachers' average NCE gain score is significantly different from the non-permanent teachers at $p<0.05$ level of significance.

Table 33.
Adjusted NCE Gain by Program and Teacher Status

Tests	Open Court						Success For All					
	Permanent Teachers			Other Teachers			Permanent Teachers			Other Teachers		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
2nd Grade												
Reading	24,310	.05	1.05	19,323	-.07	1.02	1,779	-.07	.97	2,029	-.19	1.05
Reading Vocabulary	25,351	.03	1.11	20,243	-.15	1.10	1,918	-.26	1.09	2,209	-.35	1.14
Reading Comprehension	25,626	-.07	1.03	20,448	-.18	1.02	1,918	-.10	1.03	2,256	-.22	1.07
Language	24,839	.06	1.10	19,985	-.14	1.08	1,840	-.20	1.05	2,133	-.33	1.10
Spelling	25,727	.01	1.04	20,535	-.09	1.04	1,960	-.10	1.04	2,274	-.17	1.04
3rd Grade												
Reading	24,543	.05	.95	18,510	-.12	.93	1,643	-.08	.94	2,063	-.16	.94
Reading Vocabulary	24,937	.09	.85	18,864	-.02	.86	1,685	-.01	.88	2,123	-.11	.94
Reading Comprehension	25,623	.17	.95	19,391	-.01	.91	1,774	-.07	.93	2,231	-.14	.89
Language	25,050	.07	.89	18,929	-.04	.88	1,721	-.05	.86	2,164	-.12	.87
Spelling	25,469	.09	.97	19,336	-.00	.96	1,755	-.18	.89	2,237	-.17	1.01

What are the Open Court implementation factors that impact student outcomes?

The following indices were constructed as indicators of the Open Court 2000 program implementation based on second grade classroom/teacher observations:[13]

1. Number of minutes spent on reading/language arts (Second grade teachers spent an average of 185 minutes on reading/language arts, with a range of 97 to 237 minutes.)
2. Number of items, based on the Open Court checklist, that were present in the classroom (There were 8 items on the second grade checklist. Teachers averaged 7 items, with a range of 5 to 8 items.)
3. If the Open Court activities matched the district's pacing plan (This variable was coded as behind (1), on target (2), or ahead (3). Sixty percent of the teachers were on target, 40% were behind, and 0% were ahead of target.)
4. Number of days behind or ahead of the pacing plan (This varied from 34 days behind to 2 days ahead. We judged anything from –5 days to +5 days on target.)
5. If the observer saw the teacher conducting lessons on alphabetics, if they saw the students reading for fluency, and if they saw a lesson on comprehension (This could range from 0 to 3; however, all of the classrooms did 2 or 3 of these.)
6. If the observer saw a lesson from the green section, from the red section, and from the blue section (This ranged from 0 to 3, with a mean of 1.65.)
7. If the observer saw Independent Work Time conducted properly (This was rated a zero for no and a one for yes. The mean was .19.)

[13] The correlations for the third grade classrooms were not significant and therefore were eliminated from this analysis.

8. How well the teacher implemented the Open Court program (This is based on if he/she conducted lessons in the green section, the red section, and the blue section; how well he/she followed the instructor's manual; and if he/she conducted IWT according to program guidelines. Teachers were rated on a scale of 1(low) to 5 (high).)

Multiple Regression analysis was used to examine the collective and individual effects of these factors on student gain only for 2nd grade since this is the first year of Open Court implementation at grade 3. Table 34 presents a summary of the regression analyses for reading and language, two major indicators of student reading achievement. For both reading and language outcomes, instruction in the three areas suggested by the National Reading Panel (alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension) and instruction in the three sections of Open Court (green, red, and blue) were the most significant predictors of achievement gains. In addition, adhering to the district suggested pacing plan was another significant predictor of language achievement gain.

Table 34.
Summary of the Regression Analyses for Grade 2 Achievement Gains

Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable	Standardized Coefficient	T-value	R-Square Change	Cumulative R-Square
Reading	AFC	0.29	3.89***	0.05	0.05
	GRB	0.27	3.59***	0.07	0.12
Language	PAC	0.32	2.99***	0.04	0.04
	AFC	0.37	4.59***	0.02	0.06
	GRB	0.16	6.01***	0.17	0.23

*** Indicates that P< .001
PAC: (Pacing Score) Whether class was ahead, on target, or behind of the district's pacing plan
AFC: Whether alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension instruction occurred
GRB: Whether lessons from the Open Court green, red, and blue sessions occurred

None of the other classroom variables were significant predictors of achievement gains at grade 2. As mentioned previously, achievement differences between permanent and non-permanent teachers were found. Therefore, we examined whether permanent teachers versus non-permanent teachers varied in regard to these same variables.

Different patterns emerged for permanent and non-permanent teachers. In second grade, permanent teachers spent less time on reading/language arts and were more likely to do alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension activities. However, they were less likely to be seen as implementing the Open Court program well. Even though they were less likely to conduct activities from all three Open Court components, they were more likely to do IWT. The findings for the third grade teachers were slightly different; however, it is important to remember that for most of these teachers this is the first year teaching Open Court whereas the second grade teachers have been teaching the program for at least two years. In general, third grade permanent teachers were less likely to teach lessons in alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension; however, there were differences in how they implemented the Open Court program. Third grade permanent teachers were less likely to have the room set up completely but were more likely to be on target or ahead on the pacing plan and were less likely to do IWT. Overall, non-permanent teachers were more likely to receive a higher overall implementation rating than permanent teachers in both second and third grade. This indicates that newer teachers are more likely to follow the program guidelines than more experienced teachers.

One can speculate further as to why these various differences are occurring; however, in the 2002-2003 evaluation the teachers will be observed and questioned as to

why they make the instructional choices they do in their classrooms. This will provide us with a better understanding of these types of classroom variations.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendation

School-Level Implementation

Overall, the results of the District Reading Plan evaluation indicate that school-level implementation improved from Year 1 to Year 2. However, staff continued to request additional professional development especially in helping English learners, teaching writing, and conducting IWT.

Almost all of the teachers had received the program materials representing an improvement from both 2000-2001 and 1999-2000. However, no teacher or students should lack materials.

Although almost all of the Open Court principals, coaches, and teachers attended workshops, they expressed the need for additional professional development. Most of the principals felt they needed to have a better understanding of the program's components. Their staff supported this belief. The coaches felt their biggest need was in how to teach the writing component but principals felt coaches needed training in how to help the English learners and how to improve their coaching skills. Teachers wanted additional professional development in teaching writing, conducting Independent Work Time, pacing the program, and helping the English learners. The principals and coaches supported these perceptions and requests. Additional professional development needs to be offered to the principals, the coaches, and the teachers perhaps during non-work hours so as not to pull staff away from their school duties. The coaches absence from the school, and therefore the classrooms, was viewed by principals as a problem in the implementation of the program. The Success for All staff expressed many of these same needs as well.

Principal support is considered critical to the schools' success. Although principal support did improve from Year 1 to Year 2, it is still very low. Perhaps as the principals become more familiar with the components of the program through additional professional development, they will be able to better support the program in their schools. Principals need to receive specific guidance regarding the importance of their support and the steps they should be taking.

The effectiveness of the coaching component is also crucial to the program's success. Overall, the principals and teachers found the support provided by the coaches/facilitators useful. In both programs, the coaches/facilitators were found to be most useful in distributing or making sure the teachers had all of the instructional materials. Perhaps an assistant/office worker could take care of items like distributing materials, managing the assessment process (entering data and distributing reports), and checking room set-up, freeing the coach/facilitator to spend more time observing classrooms and helping with instructional practices. The coaches/facilitators need to spend less time on the logistical aspects of the program and more time helping teachers with their instructional practices.

Open Court principals, coaches, and teachers all felt the program was more successful this year than last in addressing the needs of the English Learners. However, they still found it most successful in addressing the needs of the standard English learners and those students reading above grade level. Success for All principals felt their program addressed the needs of the English learners less this year than last year whereas the facilitators and teachers felt there was no difference. The Success for All principals, facilitators, and teachers also found the program most successful with the students

reading above grade level. Program staff needs to continue their efforts to address the needs of the English learners, the bulk of the students in the early elementary grades. As the Open Court program was not designed for the English learners, teachers need additional professional development and assistance from the coaches in how to modify the program in order to meet the needs of these students. Success for All is taught in Spanish; therefore, it is unclear why it is perceived as not addressing the needs of the English learners.

Classroom-Level Implementation

Overall, the teachers were spending much of their school day on reading/language arts but varied widely in how much of the programs they completed. The teachers were observed doing lessons on alphabetics, having the students read for fluency, and working on comprehension skills and strategies. Some writing was seen in almost every classroom. However, these activities were not always part of Open Court or Success for All.

Similar to last year, teachers were still not displaying all of the program materials in the Open Court classrooms. They were often missing the Concept/Question Board and the Inquiry area. This is an important part of the Open Court program. Success for All classrooms were also missing important physical elements of the program. In both programs, the teachers were exceeding the required amount of time on reading/language arts. In the Success for All schools (grades 1-3), this included the designated 90 minutes in the Success for All classes (Roots and Wings). In both programs, this left little time for other subjects. After reading/language arts, mathematics was the most frequently observed subject. Even though the teachers were spending more than the required

amount of time on reading/language arts, they were still unable to finish all of their lessons each day. It is hoped that as teachers become more familiar with the use of the program they will become more efficient; however, making accommodations to meet the needs of their students is affecting their ability to move through all of the materials and probably will continue to do so.

This same problem surfaced when we examined the teachers' progress through the lessons in comparison to the suggested pacing plans. However, when we compared second grade teachers over two years, they were able to follow the plan better the second year. As many of the teachers were behind on the pacing plan, the pacing plan may be unrealistic. Not being able to complete all of the lessons is a concern for the teachers. Program staff may need to look at the materials and the pacing plans, prioritizing the most important lessons. The teachers are already doing this themselves but perhaps a more systematic approach is needed to maintain consistency.

Most of the Open Court teachers and almost all of the Success for All teachers indicated that they were using the assessment results to guide their instruction. All of the teachers should be using these test results to help them determine areas of student weakness so they know what to review and emphasize with specific students during Independent Work Time. The coaches/facilitators need to work with the teachers so they all know how to use the results to help their students.

The Open Court teachers reported that they needed help with Independent Work Time. The observations supported that many of the teachers were not conducting IWT or were doing so but not following the program guidelines. Coaches need to work with the

teachers on this component, as it is an important part of the Open Court program. This is a time when the teacher can help the struggling students.

Most of the Success for All teachers said they sent students to tutoring; however, one-quarter of them indicated that they couldn't send students who needed it because of lack of tutoring slots. Additional tutoring opportunities need to be provided so no student misses out on extra assistance when needed.

According to the observations and self reports, teachers were not completing all of the daily lessons. Almost all of the Open Court kindergarten teachers spent time working from the green section, but less than half were seen doing lessons from the red and blue sections. First grade teachers were most likely to do lessons from the red section, closely followed by the green section. Second grade teachers were also most likely to be doing lessons from the red section; however, they were more likely to be doing lessons in the blue section than the green section. Third grade teachers were more likely to be working in the red section with about half also working on the green and blue sections. The inability to get to all of the sections is also true for Success for All teachers. Again, further support may be needed to help teachers get through all of their lessons on a daily basis.

In Open Court kindergarten, all of the teachers were seen working on alphabetics and almost all worked on fluency and comprehension whereas at the first grade level, all of the classrooms were seen doing all three components. In second grade, all of the classrooms did alphabetics and read for fluency and all but one worked on comprehension. In third grade there was a switch away from alphabetics. All of the classrooms read for fluency and almost all worked on comprehension. This move away

from alphabetics was also seen in the Success for All Wings classrooms. As students progress, you would expect less work on alphabetics and more on reading for fluency and reading for comprehension. As the students progressed through the grade levels, the teacher was seen reading less and the students were seen reading more. There was also less listening for comprehension and more reading for comprehension. Writing was also seen to progress from drawing/coloring and completing worksheets to more creative writing and editing.

Outcome Measures

Based on adjusted gain scores, Open Court students at the district level significantly outperformed Success for All students in all subject areas across grades; however, the differential gains were small and the only educationally meaningful differences were in second grade Reading Vocabulary and third grade Reading Comprehension and Spelling.

The goal of the District Reading Plan is literacy for every student by third grade. Only 25% of the third grade students were found to be literate based on scoring at the 50th percentile or higher on Reading, Language, and Spelling. However, the percentages are higher in first and second grade, which may reflect the fact that the District Reading Plan was implemented first in kindergarten through second grade. Third grade was added to the Open Court program just this year.

Student variables, teacher variables, and classroom variables were also examined in relation to achievement gains. Overall, there were no educationally meaningful differences between Black and Hispanic students; however, achievement gains favored Hispanic students. EO students scored higher than LEP students in Reading Vocabulary

in second grade, and in Reading, Reading Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension in third grade. These differences were educationally meaningful. ELD levels III and IV scored higher than ELD levels I and II on all tests across both grades. Differences in second grade Reading Vocabulary and Language and third grade Reading Comprehension and Spelling were educationally meaningful. Permanent teachers had a positive effect on student achievement. Students with permanent teachers scored higher than students with non-permanent teachers; however, even though all of the comparisons were statistically significant none were educationally meaningful.

Based on indices created from the observation data, we looked at the collective and individual effects of these factors on student gains in second grade. Conducting lessons in alphabetics, reading for fluency, and conducting lessons in comprehension as well as conducting Open Court lessons from the green, red, and blue sections were the most significant predictors for reading gains. These two factors plus how well teachers were keeping up with the pacing plan were the most significant predictors for language gains. This finding reinforces the importance of both covering all of the three National Reading Panel instructional areas central in learning how to read as well as conducting lessons in all three of the Open Court sections.

2002-2003 Evaluation

The focus of the 2002-2003 evaluation will be on the instructional activities occurring in the classroom. The observations took place within the first two months of the 2002-2003 school year. Each teacher was observed for a total of three days during his or her reading/language arts period. Observers documented teacher pedagogy using an observation protocol that required them to provide a detailed narrative of what took place

during the instructional period and complete various checklists. These data are presently being analyzed to determine the overall quality of pedagogy being used by each teacher during his or her reading/language arts instructional period. Later in the school year, the teachers will be questioned as to their choice of instructional practices. The impact of the program on achievement gains will also again be assessed.

References

Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round, $p<.05$. American Psychologist, 49, 999-1003.

Morris, J. (2002). The role of literacy coaches in implementing research based reading programs at low achieving schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. (NIH Publication No. 00-4754).

Schacter, J. (2001). Reading programs that work: A review of programs for pre-kindergarten to 4th grade. ERS Spectrum.

Stanford Achievement Test Series Ninth Edition: Technical Data Report. (1997). San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Appendix

Interaction Effect Sizes for Program by Other Factors

Factors	Grade	Reading		Reading Vocabulary		Reading Comp.		Language		Spelling	
Program by Ethnicity											
		1st ES	2nd ES	1st ES	2nd ES	1st ES	2nd ES	1st ES	2nd ES	1st ES	2nd ES
	2nd Grade	.03	**.31**	**.23**	**.26**						
	3rd Grade							.04	**.25**		
Program by Language Classification											
	2nd Grade	.13	**.22**	**.44**	.09	.01	.14				
	3rd Grade	.04	.05	**.33**	.08	**.45**	.06	.19	.10		
Program by Teacher Permanency											
	2nd Grade			**.34**	.12						
	3rd Grade	**.22**	.05			**.32**	.06			**.27**	.18

1. Effect sizes (ES) are reported only when there was a significant interaction between factors.

2. For Ethnicity, 1st ES represents the effect size of comparing Black students in Open Court with Hispanic students in Success for All, and 2nd ES represents the effect size of comparing Hispanic students in Open Court with Black students in Success for All.

3. For Language Classification, 1st ES represents the effect size of comparing EO students in Open Court with LEP students in Success for All, and 2nd ES represents the effect size of comparing LEP students in Open Court with EO students in Success for All.

4. For Teacher Permanency, 1st ES represents the effect size of comparing Open Court permanent teachers with Success for All non-permanent teachers, and 2nd ES represents the effect size of non-permanent teachers in Open Court with permanent teachers in Success for All.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").